

Project Title	Water/Sewer Monthly Billing Project	Reporting Date: September 18, 2012
Quality Assurance Executive Summary		
Authored by:	Pacific Consulting Group, Inc. (PCG)	
Overall Rating	Yellow	(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	Deteriorating
Overall Score	Calculated	3.7
Risk Management	Carried from worksheet	3.6
Project Deliverables	Carried from worksheet	3.4
Project Management	Carried from worksheet	4.1
Product Deliverables	Carried from worksheet	3.7
Reporting Summary	<p>This is PCG's third 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 - implemented 9/17/2012; 2) 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 was completed and placed in operation 9/17/2012 and is now in a ninety-day stabilization phase. The monthly billing component is now planned for 1Q 2013. Cayenta has planned the final software components for monthly billing by October 1, 2012. The third component, ebill distribution, will utilize third-party software recently selected by the City. The City has completed their analysis and is proceeding with contract negotiations with the selected vendor.</p>	
Changes since Last Report	Upgrade implemented on September 17, 2012; six defects identified in initial operation. User training completed for upgrade week of September 10, 2012.	
Current Recommendations	Develop QRMS acceptance criteria (for placing in production). Update Risk Log.	
Status of Prior Recommendations	<p>Prior recommendations: 1) Criteria for acceptance of the stabilization period related to the Cayenta upgrade before beginning the monthly billing implementation activities (July 2012) -completed and approved by Water and Revenue Bureaus - issue closed ; 2) an integrated, resource-loaded project plan should be prepared covering all three project components - in process by Project Team ; 3) weekly planning meetings should be instituted between the Project Manager and the Water Bureau (July 2012) - meetings are being held weekly - issue closed ; 4) User training materials for upgrade (August 2012) completed - issue closed ; 5) Cost analysis for e-bill distribution completed and approved by Bureau Director and Commissioner (August 2012) - issue closed .</p>	
Individuals Interviewed/Dates	Julie Shervey, Technical Project Manager (Revenue Bureau) 9/17/12; Kathy Koch, Project Sponsor (Water Bureau) 9/17/12; Marci Reese, Billing Supervisor (Water Bureau) 9/17/12; Robyn Deeb, Project Lead (Revenue Bureau) 9/17/12	
Documents Reviewed/Dates	Documents reviewed: User Training Materials - Upgrade (9/14/2012) ; project weekly status reports (9/18/2012); September TOC Project Status report (9/4/2012)	
Meetings Attended/Dates	TOC Meeting 9/4/2012	

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R	Reporting Date: September 18, 2012
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	Deteriorating
Overall Score	Calculated	3.6
Reporting Summary	Acceptance criteria for the QRMS implementation (criteria to move to user testing) should be developed.	
Recommendations	The project should update the Risk Log. Ten open software defects; six identified in first day of production operation.	

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			2		The Project Team reports that the Risk Log has been updated but PCG has not received the update.
R2- As risks are encountered are they being confronted in a timely manner to determine a proper response strategy?		In progress			2		The Project Team reports that the Risk Log has been updated but PCG has not received the update.
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so, how frequently?					3		Critical defects identified in the initial upgrade have been forwarded to Cayenta for resolution.
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 have been finalized by Water and Revenue Bureaus. Criteria for moving to user training for monthly billing implementation should be defined.
R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider’s team or approach?					3		Cayenta has been late in providing defect corrections; as of 9/17/2012 six production defects have been identified with the upgrade as well as four defects from testing not required for implementation.
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?					3		Cayenta has been late in providing defect corrections; as of 9/17/2012 six production defects have been identified with the upgrade as well as four defects from testing not required for implementation.

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - PR	Reporting Date: September 18, 2012
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	Deteriorating
Overall Score	Calculated	3.4
Reporting Summary	10/1/2012 for City testing; however, production defects (6) and testing defects (4) may impact their ability to maintain current schedule.	
Recommendations	Complete integrated project plan. Cayenta should commit to schedule to correct production defects.	

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 document milestone criteria for proceeding to user training for monthly billing implementation.
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?					1		Project team reports that a plan has been developed but PCG has not received the plan for review.
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?					1		Project team reports that a plan has been developed but PCG has not received the plan for review.
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?					1		Project team reports that a plan has been developed but PCG has not received the plan for review.
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				4		Schedule has been revised based on Cayenta delivery schedule and test results. Number of production defects may impact QRMS 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: September 18, 2012
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 continuing weekly planning meetings to address upgrade and monthly billing issues. Six production defects identified in initial production operation. Project team should complete an updated integrated plan including tasks, dependencies, milestones, and resources for all sub-projects/components.</i>
Overall Trend	<i>Improving/Deteriorating/Static</i>	<i>Static</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	4.1
Reporting Summary	<i>Cayenta addressed all critical defects for upgrade. Software for monthly billing scheduled for 10/1/2012 delivery.</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				5		Revenue Bureau project manager experienced with application; Water Bureau engaged with project implementation.
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				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		Negative impacts from Cayenta delays.
PM6 – Are business units and end users involved and participating as stakeholder in the project outcomes?	Yes				4		Water and Revenue Bureaus actively engaged with project.
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 monthly billing implementation in 2013.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		City turnover has not occurred.
PM9 – Are accepted industry best practices for project management being followed?					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?	Yes				4		Project team believes objectives for monthly billing can be achieved; implementation schedules may need to be adjusted based on Cayenta software delivery and quality.

Assessment Area	Product Deliverables - PD	Reporting Date: September 18, 2012
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 has historically been late. Monthly billing will require extensive system testing and user training.
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	Static
Overall Score	Calculated	3.7
Reporting Summary		
Recommendations	The Project Team should update 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 have developed criteria for "stabilization" acceptance. Criteria for moving to user training for monthly billing component should be defined.
PD2- Is the vendor performing according to contract terms? Are they responsive to issues?	Partially				4		The contracts with Cayenta for QRMS does not have specific delivery dates nor overall City implementation dates for the software . Cayenta has addressed all critical defects for upgrade.
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 all critical defects for the upgrade.
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?	Yes				4		Cayenta staff is working cooperatively with City staff to transfer responsibility for the QRMS bill print routine. Training for upgrade delivered.
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 for monthly billing needs to be confirmed based on scheduled software delivery from Cayenta.as been revised for the upgrade component implementation.