

Project Title	Water/Sewer Monthly Billing Project	Reporting Date: July 20, 2012
Quality Assurance Executive Summary		
Authored by:	<i>Pacific Consulting Group, Inc. (PCG)</i>	
Overall Rating	YELLOW	<i>(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)</i>
Overall Trend	<i>Improving/Deteriorating/Static</i>	<i>No trend data available for this initial report.</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	3.7
Risk Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	3.8
Project Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	3.4
Project Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.1
Product Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	3.4
Reporting Summary	<p><i>This is PCG's initial assessment. The Water/Sewer Monthly Billing Project has three major components: 1) upgrade the Cayenta software from version 7.5.2.13 to 7.5.3.18, implement monthly billing (for quarterly meter reading), and 3) implement electronic bill distribution using a third-party service. The upgrade activity has been underway for several months and was initially scheduled for a July 2012 implementation. However, defects in the software have resulted in a schedule delay. As of the date of our report, 23 defects remain to be corrected, 18 of which have been identified by the Water Bureau as critical. The monthly billing component is dependent on the upgrade. Cayenta has just delivered the first custom code for monthly billing. City personnel are finalizing requirements related to the collection stream business processes. Implementation dates are dependent on Cayenta completing their defect corrections for the upgrade and custom development for the monthly billing component. The third component will utilize third-party software recently selected by the City. Contract negotiations with the vendor are underway.</i></p>	
Changes since Last Report	<p><i>This is the Initial Assessment. No prior report available.</i></p>	
Current Recommendations	<p><i>PCG has three major recommendations: 1) criteria should be developed for acceptance of the stabilization period related to the Cayenta upgrade before beginning the monthly billing implementation activities; 2) an integrated, resource-loaded project plan should be prepared covering all three project components; and 3) weekly planning meetings should be instituted between the Project Manager and the Water Bureau Sponsor related to implementation planning.</i></p>	
Status of Prior Recommendations	<p><i>None (first report)</i></p>	
Individuals Interviewed/Dates	<p><i>Julie Shervey, Technical Project Manager (Revenue Bureau) 7/2/2012, 7/10/2012, and 7/19/2012 Kathy Koch, Project Sponsor (Water Bureau) 7/9/2012 Robyn Deeb, Project Lead 7/2/2012 and 7/19/2012 Kirsten Klym, Technical Lead 7/19/2012 Jim Hagerman, Bureau of Environmental Services 7/9/2012 David Shaff, Water Bureau Director 7/19/2012 Marcy Reese, Water Bureau (Billing Supervisor) 7/9/2012</i></p>	
Documents Reviewed/Dates	<p><i>The following documents were reviewed in preparation for this report:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Change Management Plan</i> <i>Training Plan</i> <i>Project Charter</i> <i>Communications Plan</i> <i>Project Charter</i> <i>Project Status Reports (1/20/2012 – 7/12/2012)</i> <i>Cayenta Maintenance Contract</i> <i>Cayenta Professional Services Contract</i> 	
Meetings Attended/Dates	<p><i>QA Kick-off meeting 7/2/2012; TOC 7/10/2012</i></p>	

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R	Reporting Date
Description	A Risk Management assessment by which the Contractor evaluates the effectiveness of the risk management strategy and planning for the project.	
Overall Rating	Yellow	by which to assess the risk identification and approach.
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	No trend data available for this initial report.
Overall Score	Calculated	3.8
Reporting Summary	Acceptance criteria for the upgrade and QRMS should be developed by the Water Bureau and the project team.	
Recommendations	The project should adopt a Risk Management Plan. This plan will be the basis by which the project's risk identification and response are evaluated.	

Metric	Green 5 points	Yellow 3 points	Red 1 points	NA 0 points	Score	Trend 	Reporting Summary
R1 - Does a Risk Management Plan exist for the project?		In progress			3		Risks were initially identified in the Project Plan for the Cayenta upgrade and QRMS. An integrated risk log is in progress.
R2- As risks are encountered are they being confronted in a timely manner to determine a proper response strategy?		In progress			3		Risks were initially identified in the Project Plan for the Cayenta upgrade and QRMS. An integrated risk log is in progress.
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so, how frequently?		Yes			3		Defects related to the Cayenta upgrade have delayed the project. Cayenta has been slow to deliver defect corrections.
R4- Is the project experiencing variances from budget baselines? Are significant cost overruns occurring? Have significant milestones been missed? If so, how frequently?	No				4		Delays may impact internal labor costs; Cayenta work is fixed price.
R5 – Are stakeholders engaged and aligned on project roles, authority and outcomes?	Yes				5		Roles and responsibilities are documented. Stakeholders are engaged.
R6 – Do business and technology leadership have shared expectations for urgency and priority?	Yes				4		Acceptance criteria for system implementation should be documented by Water and Revenue Bureaus.
R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider’s team or approach?		Partially			3		Cayenta has been late in providing defect corrections.
R8- Are the projects human resources appropriately skilled and prepared for the project?	Yes				5		City team has significant experience with Cayenta product.
R9 – Are technology risk being addressed and planned for?	Yes				5		Yes risks are being addressed for the upgrade and QRMS components. E-Billing distribution component risk is unknown at this time.
R10 – Are factors external to the project negatively influencing the project team’s ability to succeed?		Partially			3		Cayenta has been late in providing defect corrections related to the upgrade. The first portion of the QRMS software was delivered July 16 and is now being tested by the City staff.

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - PR	Reporting Date
Description	A Verification of Project Deliverables by which the Contractor evaluates if deliverables are appropriately scoped and detailed with respect to the current phase, included but not limited to: Project Management Plan, Change Management, Project Budget, Project Schedule and Project Communications.	
Overall Rating	Yellow	Project needs a single integrated detailed schedule, including tasks, dependencies, milestones, and resources for all sub-projects/components. The plan should include tasks and resources for the City staff and the vendor.
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	No trend data available for this initial report.
Overall Score	Calculated	3.4
Reporting Summary	Cayenta software has been of good quality; however defects have been late in delivery delaying the upgrade implementation. This has also delayed the QRMS component.	
Recommendations	Project deliverables should be completed.	

Metric	Green 5 points	Yellow 3 points	Red 1 points	NA 0 points	Score	Trend 	Reporting Summary
PR1 – Does the project have a clearly defined business case with clear objectives and criteria for success and performance metrics?	Yes				4		Water and Revenue Bureaus should define acceptance criteria for upgrade stabilization and QRMS stabilization.
PR2- Have all business, functional and technical requirements been clearly documented and prioritized by stakeholders?	Partially				4		Not all requirements for QRMS have been completed.
PR3- Does the project have a realistic timeline based on a work breakdown structure analysis of required activities?		Partially			3		Project should develop a single integrated, resource-loaded project plan.
PR4 – Does the project have a realistic budget? Are adequate financial resources available to accomplish the projects goals?	Yes				4		Budget is reasonable unless significant delays in Cayenta delivery (impacting City staff budget) occur.
PR5 – Does the project plan contain all tasks required to successfully deliver the project?			No		1		Project Plan is at a high level. Resources are not identified.
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?		Partially			2		Schedule will need to be adjusted based on Cayenta defect correction delivery.
PR7- Does the project have a formal Change Management Plan? Are changes to scope following these processes?	Partially				4		A Change Management Plan exists. Additional clarification on impact of QRMS on Water Bureau operations will be needed.
PR8 – Are communications on the project happening in a timely manner to the right audiences?	Partially				4		Additional weekly planning meetings focused on short-term activities should be instituted, including the Project Team and Water Bureau.
PR9 – Is the Project Manager actively managing schedule and tasks? Is the project plan up to date and accurately reflect project scope?	Yes				4		Schedule will need to be revised based on Cayenta delivery schedule.
PR10 – Is the Project Manager taking appropriate action in response to the occurrence issues and risks?	Yes				4		Issues are identified and tracked with Cayenta.

Assessment Area	Project Management - PM	Reporting Date
Description	<i>The Project Management assessment area evaluates the projects organization, roles and responsibilities and management oversight to ensure the project has engaged all stakeholders at the appropriate level and is provided clear authority, managerial support and business ownership.</i>	
Overall Rating	Green	<i>The project for the upgrade component has been underway for several months. The QRMS and e-bill distribution components have been underway since spring 2012. An integrated project plan with specific resource assignments should be prepared.</i>
Overall Trend	<i>Improving/Deteriorating/Static</i>	<i>No trend data available for this initial report.</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	4.1
Reporting Summary	<i>Delays by Cayenta in addressing software defects in the upgrade component have delayed both the upgrade and the QRMS component (which is dependent on the upgrade being implemented). Revised implementation dates for both the upgrade and QRMS need to be developed and verified.</i>	
Recommendations	<i>Continue to develop project plans, including those listed above.</i>	

Metric	Green 5 points	Yellow 3 points	Red 1 points	NA 0 points	Score	Trend 	Reporting Summary
PM1 – Does the project have an experienced project manager and executive sponsor assigned to the project?	Yes				5		
PM2-Are all project roles and responsibilities clearly defined and assigned?	Yes				5		
PM3- Is the City effectively leveraging its contractual authority to resolve issues with vendors and subcontractors?		Partially			3		Contract with Cayenta for upgrade provides little leverage related to defect correction.
PM4 – Are the Project Manager, Sponsor and Steering Committee heeding project warning signs and effectively managing risk?	Yes				5		
PM5 – Is the project experiencing negative impacts due to unresolved issues?		Partially			3		Negative impacts from Cayenta delays.
PM6 – Are business units and end users involved and participating as stakeholder in the project outcomes?	Yes				5		
PM7 – Is the City properly prepared for the organizational and cultural changes that the project will affect?		Partially			3		QRMS will impact Water Bureau operations. Water Bureau and project staff have not fully assessed the business process changes related to QRMS. This work is scheduled to begin in August.
PM8 – Has turnover occurred on key roles such as the PM, Sponsor, Steering Committee or leads? If so, are transitions being managed properly?	No				5		City turnover has not occurred.
PM9 – Are accepted industry best practices for project management being followed?		Partially			3		Several project management practices are in place today. The project should prepare an updated project plan and strengthen the issue and risk management practices.
PM10 – Does the project team have confidence that the project goals are obtainable given the project scope, budget and timeline?	Partially				4		Project team believes objectives for upgrade and QRMS can be achieved; implementation schedules will need to be adjusted

Assessment Area	Product Deliverables - PD	Reporting Date
Description	A Verification of Product Deliverables by which the Contractor verifies if product deliverables are of acceptable quality and delivered on agreed upon schedule and cost.	
Overall Rating	Yellow	The overall quality of the software delivered by Cayenta has been good; however, defect corrections have been late resulting in schedule slippage. The first portion of the QRMS software was received July 16 and is in testing by the City staff.
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	This is the initial report.
Overall Score	Calculated	3.4
Reporting Summary	Assessment for this area is from an interview with the Project Manager and the Project Sponsor.	
Recommendations	The project should develop a comprehensive Project Management Plan, Test Plan, and Deployment Plan for all sub-projects. Similarly a single integrated and detailed schedule should be developed to include tasks, dependencies, milestones, and resource allocations for all tasks and all sub-projects. These will be the basis for evaluating when and how project products are to be evaluated.	

Metric	Green 5 points	Yellow 3 points	Red 1 points	NA 0 points	Score	Trend 	Reporting Summary
PD1 - Does the project have clear criteria for testing and acceptance?		Partially			3		Overall project criteria is documented. Water and Revenue Bureaus should develop criteria for "stabilization" acceptance.
PD2- Is the vendor performing according to contract terms? Are they responsive to issues?		Partially			3		The contracts with Cayenta for both the upgrade and QRMS do not have specific delivery dates nor overall City implementation dates for the software .
PD3 - Are the vendor's methodologies and work processes compatible with the City standards and best practices?	Yes				4		The final software quality as delivered is good, although often late.
PD4 - Is the vendor showing discipline and diligence to reduce the impacts of change to the project and agreed upon scopes of work?		Partially			3		The vendor's scope is well managed; vendor schedule delivery has been late.
PD5 - Are the vendors demonstrating best practice quality assurance processes and controls in the development of deliverables?	Yes				4		The final software quality as delivered is good.
PD6 - Are deliverables being provided that meet the business need and are fit for use?		Partially			3		The project manager and the technical lead report that the readability and completeness of the software documentation from Cayenta should be improved.
PD7 – Are deliverables provided of quality that meets or exceeds City requirements?	Partially				4		
PD8 - Is proper training, knowledge transfer and documentation accompanying all vendor deliverables?		Partially			3		Cayenta documentation to provide knowledge transfer to City staff has been marginal. Cayenta staff are working cooperatively with City staff to transfer responsibility for the QRMS bill print routine.
PD9 –Is staff turnover occurring on the vendor's project teams? Are contractual processes being followed for the reassignment of vendor staff to the project? Is proper knowledge transfer occurring?		Some			3		There are some staff reassignments by Cayenta; contract does not provide a mechanism to enforce consistent staff assignments.
PD10 – Does the project manager have confidence that the vendor is able and committed to deliver the project on schedule with required scope?		Partially			4		Scope and functionality can be achieved; schedule will be delayed.