

# **Linux and Open Source Databases Migration to Microsoft Azure advanced specialization Program**

## **Final Report**

Bosch

Audit Date: 27 October 2021

Gap Review Meeting Date: NA

Audit Process and Criteria: Version 2.0

Prepared by: Meet Shah, [mshah@issi-inc.com](mailto:mshah@issi-inc.com)

Report Submission Date: 28 October 2021

## Introduction

The audit was conducted to the requirements of the Linux and Open Source Databases Migration to Microsoft Azure advanced specialization Audit Process and Criteria V2.0.

The working language of the audit was: English

The following personnel participated in the audit:

Name	Title	Email
Syed Yousuff	Practice Head: IT Infra, Cloud and Platforms	<a href="mailto:Syed.yousuff@in.bosch.com">Syed.yousuff@in.bosch.com</a>
Marimuthu Prabhu	Delivery Head: IT Infra & Cloud	<a href="mailto:Marimuthu.Prabhu@in.bosch.com">Marimuthu.Prabhu@in.bosch.com</a>
Rahul Shetty	Bussiness Area Lead: IT Infra, Cloud, Automation & Security	<a href="mailto:rahulkumarshetty.attawar@in.bosch.com">rahulkumarshetty.attawar@in.bosch.com</a>
Ashok Kumar Babu	Service Delivery Manager: Cloud Services	<a href="mailto:Babu.AshokKumar@in.bosch.com">Babu.AshokKumar@in.bosch.com</a>
Sreejith Sreekumar	Service Delivery Manager: Database Services	<a href="mailto:Sreejith.Sreekumar@in.bosch.com">Sreejith.Sreekumar@in.bosch.com</a>
Balakrishna Manjunath	Architect: Database & Big Data Platforms	<a href="mailto:balakrishnaurkeri.manjunath@in.bosch.com">balakrishnaurkeri.manjunath@in.bosch.com</a>
Vinoth Kumar A	Architect: Cloud Services	<a href="mailto:vinoth.kumara@in.bosch.com">vinoth.kumara@in.bosch.com</a>
Vigneshkumar Mani	Project Manager: Cloud Services	<a href="mailto:Vigneshkumar.Mani@in.bosch.com">Vigneshkumar.Mani@in.bosch.com</a>
Senthilnath TM	Specialist: Cloud Services	<a href="mailto:senthilnath.tm@in.bosch.com">senthilnath.tm@in.bosch.com</a>
Ravi Shankar M	Project Manager: Database Services	<a href="mailto:M.RaviShankar@in.bosch.com">M.RaviShankar@in.bosch.com</a>
Udaya Kodachadri Parameshwara	Architect: Database Services	<a href="mailto:Udaya.KodachadriParameshwara@in.bosch.com">Udaya.KodachadriParameshwara@in.bosch.com</a>
Karthik Kalirajan	Architect: Cloud Services	<a href="mailto:karthick.kalirajan@in.bosch.com">karthick.kalirajan@in.bosch.com</a>
Vamsi Krishna Dev Kornana	Specialist: Cloud Services	<a href="mailto:vamsi.krishnadev@in.bosch.com">vamsi.krishnadev@in.bosch.com</a>
Madhankumar Sivakumar	Department Quality Analyst	<a href="mailto:Madhankumar.Sivakumar@in.bosch.com">Madhankumar.Sivakumar@in.bosch.com</a>

## Audit Objectives and Methodology

The objectives of this audit were:

- to assess the Partner's capabilities in relation to the requirements of the Linux and Open Source Databases Migration to Microsoft Azure advanced specialization program.
- to share and encourage best practices and identify opportunities for Partner improvement.
- to collect and provide Microsoft with information on Partner capabilities, practices, and plans.

The audit assessed the Partner's operational capabilities against program requirements for a Microsoft Azure advanced specialization. This was assessed through discussion with Partner personnel and by reviewing selected processes and procedures, including demonstrations of tools and technologies used by the Partner to meet Azure advanced specialization requirements. Throughout the audit, considerable effort was made to

make the event valuable for the Partner by identifying opportunities for improvement and highlighting partner strengths and best practices.

The audit concluded with a review of the audit findings.

## Executive Summary

Bosch is one of the leading system integrators around Migration Services, ISV Solution development across Manufacturing, Automotive IoT Centric Solutions, and OSS DBs. Bosch's strategy - of sensors, software, and services – helps MS build tools, products, and platforms using Bosch's proven expertise to deliver real customer value.

Bosch has developed and implemented solutions in the field of Manufacturing, automobile, supply chain, healthcare, mobility energy and has experience in the usage of multiple technologies and standards across various domains.

### Audit Findings –

1. Partner has demonstrated a well-structured approach to DB Migration solutions and has been able to meet the requirements of the program.
2. Using some customers consistently across sections and some additional customers, the Partner demonstrated their experience for the specialization.
3. Across both the audit modules, the Partner demonstrated all evidence and several strength areas adequately.
4. There were some areas of improvement identified, and the Partner agreed to work on them.

### Conclusion –

Bosch demonstrated the capability to offer Azure DB Migration services to their customers against all the audit criteria. The Partner was adequately prepared to undertake the audit, and there were some areas of improvement identified.

<b>Partner Audit Scorecard</b>		
Scoring methodology:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Partner must meet 100% of each requirement for each section in the checklist.</li> <li>▪ Partner results are listed in the 'Met' column.</li> </ul>		
<b>Module A: Cloud Foundation</b>		
<b>1.0 Strategy</b>		<b>Met Y/N</b>
1.1	Data-Driven Business Strategies	Y
<b>2.0 Plan</b>		
2.1	Planning and Tracking – Cloud Adoption Projects	Y
<b>3.0 Environment readiness and Azure landing zone</b>		
3.1	Repeatable deployment	Y
<b>4.0 Governance</b>		
4.1	Governance tooling	Y
<b>5.0 Manage</b>		
5.1	Operations management tooling	Y
<b>Module B: Linux and Open Source Database Migration to Microsoft Azure workload</b>		
<b>1.0 Third-party certifications</b>		
1.1	Certification	Y
<b>2.0 Assess</b>		
2.1	Workload assessment	Y
<b>3.0 Design</b>		
3.1	Solution design	Y
3.2	Well-Architected Review of workloads	Y
<b>4.0 Deployment</b>		
4.1	Infrastructure migration	Y
4.2	Database migration	Y
4.3	Migration tools	Y
4.4	Automated deployment and provisioning tools	Y

<b>Partner Audit Scorecard</b>		
Scoring methodology:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Partner must meet 100% of each requirement for each section in the checklist.</li><li>▪ Partner results are listed in the 'Met' column.</li></ul>		
<b>5.0 Review and Release for Operations</b>		
5.1	Service validation and testing	Y
5.2	Post-deployment Documentation	Y

## Strengths

The following organizational strengths were noted during the audit:

1.	A-1.1 Partner has demonstrated a well-defined flow for requirement gathering with in-house tools.
2.	A-2.1 Partner has demonstrated a well-defined flow graph for the project onboarding with the self-service capabilities for Customers.
3.	A-3.1 Partner has demonstrated well-managed Design Documentation with HLD's and LLD's articulations separately.
4.	B-2.1 Partner has demonstrated a well-managed risk register as a risk tracking process.
5	B-4.2 Partner has defined a well demonstrated Data Migration Plan document.

## Opportunities for Improvement

The following Opportunities for Improvement were identified during the audit:

1.	A-2.1	Please consider creating standardized templates for Internal and external customers.
2.	A-3.1	Please consider addressing RTO RPO timings and DR Details in the architecture Document.
3.	B-2.1	Please consider that User and DB details need to be captured and defined into requirement gathering Documents.

## Action Items

The following Action Items were identified during the audit:

NA

## Microsoft Azure Advanced Specialization Audit Checklist

Module A: Cloud Foundation											
1.0 Strategy											
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes								
1.1 Data-Driven Business Strategies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration	Evidence validated – <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Process</td> <td>                             Both the customer documents follow a standard process to capture the below:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSA and challenges</li> <li>2. Reasons for migrating to Azure for customers.</li> <li>3. Business Outcomes were defined</li> <li>4. Economic Benefits were showcased to the customer</li> <li>5. Discovery for the services was done through iterative calls and emails.</li> <li>6. End-User satisfaction matrix created for feedback and service improvements.</li> </ol> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Customer 1 – Routematic</td> <td>                             1. Technology Strategy and Roadmap presentation dated July 20, 2020 - July 31, 2021                              2. The tool used: Azure Migrate.                              3. Cost comparison with azure cost calculator.                         </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Customer 2 – InTrack</td> <td>                             1. Technology Strategy and Roadmap v2 presentation dated April 1, 2020 - Dec 14, 2020                              2. The tool used: Azure Migrate.                              3. Cost comparison with azure cost calculator.                         </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strength –</td> <td>Partner has demonstrated a well-defined flow for requirement gathering with in-house tools.</td> </tr> </table>	Process	Both the customer documents follow a standard process to capture the below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSA and challenges</li> <li>2. Reasons for migrating to Azure for customers.</li> <li>3. Business Outcomes were defined</li> <li>4. Economic Benefits were showcased to the customer</li> <li>5. Discovery for the services was done through iterative calls and emails.</li> <li>6. End-User satisfaction matrix created for feedback and service improvements.</li> </ol>	Customer 1 – Routematic	1. Technology Strategy and Roadmap presentation dated July 20, 2020 - July 31, 2021 2. The tool used: Azure Migrate. 3. Cost comparison with azure cost calculator.	Customer 2 – InTrack	1. Technology Strategy and Roadmap v2 presentation dated April 1, 2020 - Dec 14, 2020 2. The tool used: Azure Migrate. 3. Cost comparison with azure cost calculator.	Strength –	Partner has demonstrated a well-defined flow for requirement gathering with in-house tools.
Process	Both the customer documents follow a standard process to capture the below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSA and challenges</li> <li>2. Reasons for migrating to Azure for customers.</li> <li>3. Business Outcomes were defined</li> <li>4. Economic Benefits were showcased to the customer</li> <li>5. Discovery for the services was done through iterative calls and emails.</li> <li>6. End-User satisfaction matrix created for feedback and service improvements.</li> </ol>										
Customer 1 – Routematic	1. Technology Strategy and Roadmap presentation dated July 20, 2020 - July 31, 2021 2. The tool used: Azure Migrate. 3. Cost comparison with azure cost calculator.										
Customer 2 – InTrack	1. Technology Strategy and Roadmap v2 presentation dated April 1, 2020 - Dec 14, 2020 2. The tool used: Azure Migrate. 3. Cost comparison with azure cost calculator.										
Strength –	Partner has demonstrated a well-defined flow for requirement gathering with in-house tools.										

2.0 Plan			
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes
2.1			

2.0 Plan					
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes		
Planning and Tracking – Cloud Adoption Projects	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Process <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration	Evidence validated –		
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Process</td> <td>                     Inhouse created Self-Service is used to track cloud adoption and deployment for all customers.                     <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The tool used for tracking: Euvantage (In-House Developed)</li> <li>Delivery timeline estimations are well defined in Plan with action trackers.</li> <li>Evidence is kept as Email and Excel Docs for delivering to customers.</li> <li>Track of all the Work Orders according to change in requirements are define clearly</li> </ol> </td> </tr> </table>	Process	Inhouse created Self-Service is used to track cloud adoption and deployment for all customers. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The tool used for tracking: Euvantage (In-House Developed)</li> <li>Delivery timeline estimations are well defined in Plan with action trackers.</li> <li>Evidence is kept as Email and Excel Docs for delivering to customers.</li> <li>Track of all the Work Orders according to change in requirements are define clearly</li> </ol>
			Process	Inhouse created Self-Service is used to track cloud adoption and deployment for all customers. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The tool used for tracking: Euvantage (In-House Developed)</li> <li>Delivery timeline estimations are well defined in Plan with action trackers.</li> <li>Evidence is kept as Email and Excel Docs for delivering to customers.</li> <li>Track of all the Work Orders according to change in requirements are define clearly</li> </ol>	
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Customer 1- Routematic</td> <td> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project deployment timelines were as per below. Start Date: 20 Jul 2020 End Date: 31 July 2021</li> <li>Project kick-off, Presales</li> <li>Use case validations post PoC</li> <li>Onboarding flow graph</li> </ol> </td> </tr> </table>	Customer 1- Routematic	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project deployment timelines were as per below. Start Date: 20 Jul 2020 End Date: 31 July 2021</li> <li>Project kick-off, Presales</li> <li>Use case validations post PoC</li> <li>Onboarding flow graph</li> </ol>
			Customer 1- Routematic	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project deployment timelines were as per below. Start Date: 20 Jul 2020 End Date: 31 July 2021</li> <li>Project kick-off, Presales</li> <li>Use case validations post PoC</li> <li>Onboarding flow graph</li> </ol>	
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Customer 2 – InTrack</td> <td> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Plan from Discovery, Azure Foundation, Deployment. The project deployment timeline: Start Date: 1 Apr 2020 End Date: 14 Dec 2020</li> <li>Project kick-off, Presales</li> <li>Use case validations post PoC</li> <li>Onboarding flow graph</li> </ol> </td> </tr> </table>	Customer 2 – InTrack	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Plan from Discovery, Azure Foundation, Deployment. The project deployment timeline: Start Date: 1 Apr 2020 End Date: 14 Dec 2020</li> <li>Project kick-off, Presales</li> <li>Use case validations post PoC</li> <li>Onboarding flow graph</li> </ol>			
Customer 2 – InTrack	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Plan from Discovery, Azure Foundation, Deployment. The project deployment timeline: Start Date: 1 Apr 2020 End Date: 14 Dec 2020</li> <li>Project kick-off, Presales</li> <li>Use case validations post PoC</li> <li>Onboarding flow graph</li> </ol>				
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Strength</td> <td>Partner has demonstrated a well-defined flow graph for the project onboarding with the self-service capabilities for Customers.</td> </tr> </table>	Strength	Partner has demonstrated a well-defined flow graph for the project onboarding with the self-service capabilities for Customers.			
Strength	Partner has demonstrated a well-defined flow graph for the project onboarding with the self-service capabilities for Customers.				
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>OFI</td> <td>Standardized templates can be created by the partner for Internal and external customers.</td> </tr> </table>	OFI	Standardized templates can be created by the partner for Internal and external customers.			
OFI	Standardized templates can be created by the partner for Internal and external customers.				

3.0 Environment readiness and Azure landing zone			
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes
3.1			



3.0 Environment readiness and Azure landing zone				
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes	
Repeatable deployment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration	Evidence validated –	
			Process	1. User Roles are defined. 2. Tools Used: ARM Template, key vaults, Azure management group 3. Segregation of users with a category. 4. Azure AD Integration for Users onboarding.
			Customer 1 – Routematic	It follows the "Enterprise Scale" deployment velocity.
			Customer 2 – InTrack	It follows the "start small and expand" deployment velocity.
			Strength	Partner has demonstrated well-managed Design Documentation with HLD's and LLD's articulations separately.
OFI	RTO RPO timings and DR Details need to be addressed in the architecture Document.			

4.0 Governance			
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes
4.1 Governance tooling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demonstration	Evidence validated –
			Process

4.0 Governance									
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes						
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>9. Azure security center and governance policy defined on Firewall</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Customer 1 - Routematic</td> <td>Azure Policy deployment for VmSizePolicyDefintion has the Standard VMs as denied, and the rest of VM sizes are allowed.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Customer 2 - InTrack</td> <td>Region policy definition that is used to limit the region where the VMs can be deployed.</td> </tr> </table>		9. Azure security center and governance policy defined on Firewall	Customer 1 - Routematic	Azure Policy deployment for VmSizePolicyDefintion has the Standard VMs as denied, and the rest of VM sizes are allowed.	Customer 2 - InTrack	Region policy definition that is used to limit the region where the VMs can be deployed.
	9. Azure security center and governance policy defined on Firewall								
Customer 1 - Routematic	Azure Policy deployment for VmSizePolicyDefintion has the Standard VMs as denied, and the rest of VM sizes are allowed.								
Customer 2 - InTrack	Region policy definition that is used to limit the region where the VMs can be deployed.								

5.0 Manage							
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes				
5.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process	Evidence validated –				
Operations management tooling	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Process</td> <td> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-defined documents for training customers.</li> <li>Partner uses Grafana Monitoring to manage the customer environments using Azure APIs.</li> </ol> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Customer 1- Routematic</td> <td>Azure Monitoring demonstration was done as part of Operations Management</td> </tr> </table>	Process	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-defined documents for training customers.</li> <li>Partner uses Grafana Monitoring to manage the customer environments using Azure APIs.</li> </ol>	Customer 1- Routematic	Azure Monitoring demonstration was done as part of Operations Management
Process	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-defined documents for training customers.</li> <li>Partner uses Grafana Monitoring to manage the customer environments using Azure APIs.</li> </ol>						
Customer 1- Routematic	Azure Monitoring demonstration was done as part of Operations Management						

Module B: Linux and Open Source Databases Migration to Microsoft Azure workload					
1.0 Third-party certifications					
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes		
1.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Process	Evidence validated –		
Certification	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Evidence</td> <td>1. Certificate verified for 2 employees with Employment letter and</td> </tr> </table>	Evidence	1. Certificate verified for 2 employees with Employment letter and
Evidence	1. Certificate verified for 2 employees with Employment letter and				

2.0 Assess									
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes						
2.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process	Evidence validated –						
Workload assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Process</td> <td> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-managed Azure solution design document template.</li> <li>Properly defined HLDs and LLDs with all required details.</li> <li>Process Flow: Customer pitch -&gt; Questionnaire-&gt; Customer Discussion -&gt; Architecture -&gt; Validation -&gt; BOM and Proposal</li> <li>Governance is being done through Azure built-in policies.</li> <li>Migretion Plan with details of Data volumes, data sizes</li> <li>Excel sheet with Timelines for each task</li> <li>Licencing and cost management was showcased through Azure Cost Calculator</li> </ol> <p>List of customer presented for this control:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Routematic</li> <li>InTrack</li> <li>WCMS</li> </ol> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strength</td> <td>Partner has demonstrated a well-managed risk register as a risk tracking process.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OFI</td> <td>User and DB details need to be captured and defined into requirement gathering Documents by the partner.</td> </tr> </table>	Process	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-managed Azure solution design document template.</li> <li>Properly defined HLDs and LLDs with all required details.</li> <li>Process Flow: Customer pitch -&gt; Questionnaire-&gt; Customer Discussion -&gt; Architecture -&gt; Validation -&gt; BOM and Proposal</li> <li>Governance is being done through Azure built-in policies.</li> <li>Migretion Plan with details of Data volumes, data sizes</li> <li>Excel sheet with Timelines for each task</li> <li>Licencing and cost management was showcased through Azure Cost Calculator</li> </ol> <p>List of customer presented for this control:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Routematic</li> <li>InTrack</li> <li>WCMS</li> </ol>	Strength	Partner has demonstrated a well-managed risk register as a risk tracking process.	OFI	User and DB details need to be captured and defined into requirement gathering Documents by the partner.
Process	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well-managed Azure solution design document template.</li> <li>Properly defined HLDs and LLDs with all required details.</li> <li>Process Flow: Customer pitch -&gt; Questionnaire-&gt; Customer Discussion -&gt; Architecture -&gt; Validation -&gt; BOM and Proposal</li> <li>Governance is being done through Azure built-in policies.</li> <li>Migretion Plan with details of Data volumes, data sizes</li> <li>Excel sheet with Timelines for each task</li> <li>Licencing and cost management was showcased through Azure Cost Calculator</li> </ol> <p>List of customer presented for this control:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Routematic</li> <li>InTrack</li> <li>WCMS</li> </ol>								
Strength	Partner has demonstrated a well-managed risk register as a risk tracking process.								
OFI	User and DB details need to be captured and defined into requirement gathering Documents by the partner.								

3.0 Design					
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes		
3.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process	Evidence validated –		
Solution design	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration			
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Evidence</td> <td> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Migration of Linux-based applications to Azure: Routemetic</li> <li>2. Migration of MySQL, PostgreSQL, MongoDB: InTrack</li> <li>3. Rehost Customer: InTrack</li> <li>4. Replatform Customer: WCMS</li> <li>5. Refactor Customer: Routemetic</li> <li>6. Azure Landing zone with following components validated for: IAM, RBAC, NSG, Firewall, data backup, and Recovery.</li> <li>7. Model Type: hub and Spoke</li> <li>8. Monitoring: Prometheus + Grafana with single pane of glass</li> </ol> <p>List of customers presented for this control:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Routemetic</li> <li>2. InTrack</li> <li>3. WCMS</li> </ol> </td> </tr> </table>	Evidence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Migration of Linux-based applications to Azure: Routemetic</li> <li>2. Migration of MySQL, PostgreSQL, MongoDB: InTrack</li> <li>3. Rehost Customer: InTrack</li> <li>4. Replatform Customer: WCMS</li> <li>5. Refactor Customer: Routemetic</li> <li>6. Azure Landing zone with following components validated for: IAM, RBAC, NSG, Firewall, data backup, and Recovery.</li> <li>7. Model Type: hub and Spoke</li> <li>8. Monitoring: Prometheus + Grafana with single pane of glass</li> </ol> <p>List of customers presented for this control:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Routemetic</li> <li>2. InTrack</li> <li>3. WCMS</li> </ol>
Evidence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Migration of Linux-based applications to Azure: Routemetic</li> <li>2. Migration of MySQL, PostgreSQL, MongoDB: InTrack</li> <li>3. Rehost Customer: InTrack</li> <li>4. Replatform Customer: WCMS</li> <li>5. Refactor Customer: Routemetic</li> <li>6. Azure Landing zone with following components validated for: IAM, RBAC, NSG, Firewall, data backup, and Recovery.</li> <li>7. Model Type: hub and Spoke</li> <li>8. Monitoring: Prometheus + Grafana with single pane of glass</li> </ol> <p>List of customers presented for this control:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Routemetic</li> <li>2. InTrack</li> <li>3. WCMS</li> </ol>				
3.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Process	Evidence validated –		
Well-Architected Review of workloads	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration			
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Process</td> <td> <p>Defined milestones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Azure well-architected review questionnaire exported as CSV.</li> </ol> <p>List of customers presented for this control:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Routemetic</li> <li>2. InTrack</li> <li>3. WCMS</li> </ol> </td> </tr> </table>	Process	<p>Defined milestones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Azure well-architected review questionnaire exported as CSV.</li> </ol> <p>List of customers presented for this control:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Routemetic</li> <li>2. InTrack</li> <li>3. WCMS</li> </ol>
Process	<p>Defined milestones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Azure well-architected review questionnaire exported as CSV.</li> </ol> <p>List of customers presented for this control:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Routemetic</li> <li>2. InTrack</li> <li>3. WCMS</li> </ol>				

4.0 Deployment					
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes		
4.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process	Evidence validated –		
Infrastructure migration	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration			
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Process</td> <td> <p>Defined documents as part of Infrastructure Migration checklist</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SOW</li> <li>2. Design Document</li> <li>3. Project Plan</li> </ol> </td> </tr> </table>	Process	<p>Defined documents as part of Infrastructure Migration checklist</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SOW</li> <li>2. Design Document</li> <li>3. Project Plan</li> </ol>
Process	<p>Defined documents as part of Infrastructure Migration checklist</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SOW</li> <li>2. Design Document</li> <li>3. Project Plan</li> </ol>				

4.0 Deployment							
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes				
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>                     4. HLD                      5. LLD                      6. As build doc                      List of customers presented for this control:                      1. Routematic                      2. InTrack                      3. WCMS                 </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strength</td> <td>Partner has demonstrated well-managed Design Documentation with HLD's and LLD's articulations separately.</td> </tr> </table>		4. HLD 5. LLD 6. As build doc List of customers presented for this control: 1. Routematic 2. InTrack 3. WCMS	Strength	Partner has demonstrated well-managed Design Documentation with HLD's and LLD's articulations separately.
	4. HLD 5. LLD 6. As build doc List of customers presented for this control: 1. Routematic 2. InTrack 3. WCMS						
Strength	Partner has demonstrated well-managed Design Documentation with HLD's and LLD's articulations separately.						
4.2 Database migration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Process <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration	Evidence validated – <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Process</td> <td>                     Defined documents as part of Database Migration checklist                      1. Architecture Diagram                      2. SOW                      3. Design Document                      4. Project Plan                      5. HLD                      6. LLD                      7. As build doc                      List of customers presented for this control:                      4. Routematic                      5. InTrack                      6. WCMS                 </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strength</td> <td>Partner has defined a well demonstrated Data Migration Plan document.</td> </tr> </table>	Process	Defined documents as part of Database Migration checklist 1. Architecture Diagram 2. SOW 3. Design Document 4. Project Plan 5. HLD 6. LLD 7. As build doc List of customers presented for this control: 4. Routematic 5. InTrack 6. WCMS	Strength	Partner has defined a well demonstrated Data Migration Plan document.
Process	Defined documents as part of Database Migration checklist 1. Architecture Diagram 2. SOW 3. Design Document 4. Project Plan 5. HLD 6. LLD 7. As build doc List of customers presented for this control: 4. Routematic 5. InTrack 6. WCMS						
Strength	Partner has defined a well demonstrated Data Migration Plan document.						
4.3 Migration tools	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Process <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration	Evidence validated – <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Process</td> <td>                     Azure migration tools Demo:                      1. Azure Database Migration Service                      2. Storage Migration Service                      List of customers presented for this control:                      1. Routematic                      2. InTrack                      3. WCMS                 </td> </tr> </table>	Process	Azure migration tools Demo: 1. Azure Database Migration Service 2. Storage Migration Service List of customers presented for this control: 1. Routematic 2. InTrack 3. WCMS		
Process	Azure migration tools Demo: 1. Azure Database Migration Service 2. Storage Migration Service List of customers presented for this control: 1. Routematic 2. InTrack 3. WCMS						

4.0 Deployment					
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes		
4.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Process <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration	Evidence validated –		
Automated deployment and provisioning tools			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Process</td> <td>                     Automated Deployment demo:                     <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Azure DevOps Pipeline</li> <li>2. Terraform Code Repo</li> </ol>                     List of customers presented for this control:                     <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Routematic</li> <li>2. InTrack</li> <li>3. WCMS</li> </ol> </td> </tr> </table>	Process	Automated Deployment demo: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Azure DevOps Pipeline</li> <li>2. Terraform Code Repo</li> </ol> List of customers presented for this control: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Routematic</li> <li>2. InTrack</li> <li>3. WCMS</li> </ol>
Process	Automated Deployment demo: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Azure DevOps Pipeline</li> <li>2. Terraform Code Repo</li> </ol> List of customers presented for this control: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Routematic</li> <li>2. InTrack</li> <li>3. WCMS</li> </ol>				

5.0 Review and Release for Operations							
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes				
5.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration	Evidence validated –				
Service validation and testing			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Customer 1 - Routematic</td> <td> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Well managed service delivery and feedback system defined for customers</li> <li>2. Patching snapshot for the images: Current +2 older versions</li> <li>3. Cutover closure case includes the customer email for confirmation of closure.</li> <li>4. Project Plan with the functionality and UAT tests conducted</li> <li>5. QA tests for server checklist with the mitigation plan.</li> </ol> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Customer 2 – InTrack</td> <td> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DB testing document with the SSMS, AD, and Windows Server test cases.</li> <li>2. Email to the customer with the Project closure meeting report and customer signoff.</li> </ol> </td> </tr> </table>	Customer 1 - Routematic	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Well managed service delivery and feedback system defined for customers</li> <li>2. Patching snapshot for the images: Current +2 older versions</li> <li>3. Cutover closure case includes the customer email for confirmation of closure.</li> <li>4. Project Plan with the functionality and UAT tests conducted</li> <li>5. QA tests for server checklist with the mitigation plan.</li> </ol>	Customer 2 – InTrack	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DB testing document with the SSMS, AD, and Windows Server test cases.</li> <li>2. Email to the customer with the Project closure meeting report and customer signoff.</li> </ol>
Customer 1 - Routematic	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Well managed service delivery and feedback system defined for customers</li> <li>2. Patching snapshot for the images: Current +2 older versions</li> <li>3. Cutover closure case includes the customer email for confirmation of closure.</li> <li>4. Project Plan with the functionality and UAT tests conducted</li> <li>5. QA tests for server checklist with the mitigation plan.</li> </ol>						
Customer 2 – InTrack	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DB testing document with the SSMS, AD, and Windows Server test cases.</li> <li>2. Email to the customer with the Project closure meeting report and customer signoff.</li> </ol>						
5.2							

5.0 Review and Release for Operations					
Requirement	Met	Validated	Additional Notes		
Post-deployment Documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstration	Evidence validated – <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%; padding: 5px;">Customer 1 – HGS Canada</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">                             1. KT sessions are kept as part of teams recordings.                              2. SharePoint repository for all customer documentation, policies &amp; procedures, and KBs.                              3. Azure environment diagram.                              4. Live training sessions                              5. Troubleshooting Runbooks                              6. Monitoring dashboards for Observability                         </td> </tr> </table>	Customer 1 – HGS Canada	1. KT sessions are kept as part of teams recordings. 2. SharePoint repository for all customer documentation, policies & procedures, and KBs. 3. Azure environment diagram. 4. Live training sessions 5. Troubleshooting Runbooks 6. Monitoring dashboards for Observability
Customer 1 – HGS Canada	1. KT sessions are kept as part of teams recordings. 2. SharePoint repository for all customer documentation, policies & procedures, and KBs. 3. Azure environment diagram. 4. Live training sessions 5. Troubleshooting Runbooks 6. Monitoring dashboards for Observability				