

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	Green	<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>	4.0
Risk Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.1
Project Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.1
Project Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.1
Product Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	3.6
Reporting Summary	<p><i>This is PCG's second assessment report. 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 is now in user acceptance testing. The implementation for the upgrade is now scheduled for September 15, pending receipt and final testing of the four identified defects. Four defects were identified in the last round of regression testing and user acceptance testing that must be corrected before implementation. The monthly billing component, dependent on the upgrade, is now planned for 1Q 2013. Cayenta has planned the final software components for monthly billing by October 1, 2012. The third component will utilize third-party software recently selected by the City. The City is continuing to analyze the potential costs of this functionality before completing a contract with the selected vendor.</i></p>	
Changes since Last Report	<p><i>Improvements in upgrade regression testing results; only three critical defects outstanding as of 8/20/2012.</i></p>	
Current Recommendations	<p><i>PCG recommendations: 1) Complete upgrade training materials and 2) Complete cost analysis for electronic bill distribution by third-party vendor.</i></p>	
Status of Prior Recommendations	<p><i>Prior recommendations: 1) Criteria for acceptance of the stabilization period related to the Cayenta upgrade before beginning the monthly billing implementation activities - in process by Water and Revenue Bureaus; 2) an integrated, resource-loaded project plan should be prepared covering all three project components - in process by Project Team; and 3) weekly planning meetings should be instituted between the Project Manager and the Water Bureau - meetings are being held weekly.</i></p>	
Individuals Interviewed/Dates	<p><i>Julie Shervey, Technical Project Manager (Revenue Bureau) 8/20/12; Kathy Koch, Project Sponsor (Water Bureau) 8/20/12; Marci Reese, Billing Supervisor (Water Bureau) 8/20/12; Robyn Deeb, Project Lead (Revenue Bureau) 8/20/12; Kristen Klym, Technical Lead (Revenue Bureau) 8/27/12</i></p>	
Documents Reviewed/Dates	<p><i>Documents reviewed: Acceptance Test Plan (8/20/2012) ; project weekly status reports (8/8, 8/17, 8/23/2012); August TOC Project Status report (8/3/2012)</i></p>	
Meetings Attended/Dates	<p><i>TOC Meeting 8/14/2012</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	
Overall Score	Calculated	4.1
Reporting Summary	Acceptance criteria for the upgrade and QRMS are in development by the Water Bureau and the project team.	
Recommendations	The project should update the Risk Log.	

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		The Project Team is updating their Risk Log.
R2- As risks are encountered are they being confronted in a timely manner to determine a proper response strategy?		In progress			3		The Project Team is updating their Risk Log.
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so, how frequently?	Yes				4		Critical defects identified in the recent regression test are being addressed and should be resolved prior to the scheduled implementation.
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 are being finalized by Water and Revenue Bureaus.
R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider’s team or approach?	Partially				4		Cayenta has been late in providing defect corrections; as of 8/20/2012 only three critical
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				4		Critical defects identified in the recent regression test are being addressed and should be resolved prior to the scheduled implementation.

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 Team and Water Bureau have started weekly planning meetings to address implementation issues. Cayenta has addressed all but four critical defects required for implementation of the upgrade. Project team is preparing an updated integrated plan including tasks, dependencies, milestones, and resources for all sub-projects/components.
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	
Overall Score	Calculated	
Reporting Summary	Cayenta has addressed many critical defects with only four outstanding as of 8/28/2012.	
Recommendations	Complete integrated project plan.	

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 are finalizing acceptance criteria for upgrade stabilization and QRMS stabilization.
PR2- Have all business, functional and technical requirements been clearly documented and prioritized by stakeholders?	Yes				5		Requirements for the monthly billing component have been delivered to Cayenta and an October 1 delivery date confirmed by Cayenta.
PR3- Does the project have a realistic timeline based on a work breakdown structure analysis of required activities?		Partially			3		Project team is developing a more detailed, resource-loaded project plan for the QRMS component.
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?		In Process			3		Project team is developing a more detailed, resource-loaded project plan for the QRMS component.
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?		Partially			3		Project team is developing a more detailed, resource-loaded project plan for the QRMS component.
PR7- Does the project have a formal Change Management Plan? Are changes to scope following these processes?	Yes				5		A Change Management Plan exists. The Project Team is working with the Water Bureau to further define the change management impacts of the
PR8 – Are communications on the project happening in a timely manner to the right audiences?	Yes				5		Weekly planning meetings have been instituted between the Project Team and the Water Bureau to address implementation issues.
PR9 – Is the Project Manager actively managing schedule and tasks? Is the project plan up to date and accurately reflect project scope?	Yes				5		Schedule has been revised based on Cayenta delivery schedule and test results.
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>Project Team and Water Bureau have started weekly planning meetings to address implementation issues. Cayenta has addressed all but four critical defects required for implementation of the upgrade. Project team is preparing an updated integrated plan including tasks, dependencies, milestones, and resources for all sub-projects/components.</i>
Overall Trend	<i>Improving/Deteriorating/Static</i>	
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	
Reporting Summary	<i>Cayenta has addressed many critical defects with only four outstanding as of 8/28/2012.</i>	
Recommendations	<i>Complete integrated project plan.</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				4		Water and Revenue Bureaus are finalizing acceptance criteria for upgrade stabilization and QRMS stabilization.
PM2-Are all project roles and responsibilities clearly defined and assigned?	Yes				5		Requirements for the monthly billing component have been delivered to Cayenta and an October 1 delivery date confirmed by Cayenta.
PM3- Is the City effectively leveraging its contractual authority to resolve issues with vendors and subcontractors?		Partially			3		Project team is developing a more detailed, resource-loaded project plan for the QRMS component.
PM4 – Are the Project Manager, Sponsor and Steering Committee heeding project warning signs and effectively managing risk?	Yes				4		Budget is reasonable unless significant delays in Cayenta delivery (impacting City staff budget) occur.
PM5 – Is the project experiencing negative impacts due to unresolved issues?		In Process			3		Project team is developing a more detailed, resource-loaded project plan for the QRMS component.
PM6 – Are business units and end users involved and participating as stakeholder in the project outcomes?		Partially			3		Project team is developing a more detailed, resource-loaded project plan for the QRMS component.
PM7 – Is the City properly prepared for the organizational and cultural changes that the project will affect?	Yes				5		A Change Management Plan exists. The Project Team is working with the Water Bureau to further define the change management impacts of the upgrade.
PM8 – Has turnover occurred on key roles such as the PM, Sponsor, Steering Committee or leads? If so, are transitions being managed properly?	Yes				5		Weekly planning meetings have been instituted between the Project Team and the Water Bureau to address implementation issues.
PM9 – Are accepted industry best practices for project management being followed?	Yes				5		Schedule has been revised based on Cayenta delivery schedule and test results.
PM10 – Does the project team have confidence that the project goals are obtainable given the project scope, budget and timeline?	Yes				4		Issues are identified and tracked with Cayenta.

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	corrections have been late resulting in schedule slippage. Regression testing for the upgrade has been completed and user acceptance testing is underway. Upgrade implementation scheduled for September 15, pending correction of four critical defects.
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	
Overall Score	Calculated	3.6
Reporting Summary		
Recommendations	The Project Team is completing an updated integrated project plan with resource assignments.	

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 are developing criteria for "stabilization" acceptance.
PD2- Is the vendor performing according to contract terms? Are they responsive to issues?	Partially				4		The contracts with Cayenta for both the upgrade and QRMS do not have specific delivery dates nor overall City implementation dates for the software. Cayenta has
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				4		The vendor's scope is well managed; vendor schedule delivery has been late. Cayenta has recently addressed the majority of the critical defects.
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		Cayenta software documentation could be improved.
PD8 - Is proper training, knowledge transfer and documentation accompanying all vendor deliverables?		Partially			3		Cayenta staff is working cooperatively with City staff to transfer responsibility for the QRMS bill print routine. Project Team and the Water Bureau are developing training materials for the upgrade component implementation.
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 has been revised for the upgrade component implementation.