

<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Water/Sewer Monthly Billing Project</b>	<b>Reporting Date: October 16, 2012</b>
<b>Quality Assurance Executive Summary</b>		
<b>Authored by:</b>	<i>Pacific Consulting Group, Inc. (PCG)</i>	
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Yellow</b>	<i>(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)</i>
<b>Overall Trend</b>	<i>Improving/Deteriorating/Static</i>	<i>Deteriorating</i>
<b>Overall Score</b>	<i>Calculated</i>	<b>3.4</b>
Risk Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	3.3
Project Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	2.7
Project Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	3.9
Product Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	3.6
<b>Reporting Summary</b>	<p><i>This is PCG's fourth 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 component was completed and placed in operation 9/17/2012 and is now in a ninety-day stabilization phase. The monthly billing component is in development status with implementation planned for 2013. The final Cayenta software delivery for monthly billing has been rescheduled from October 1 to November 1, 2012, to coincide with the software delivery from the Bureau of Technology Services. The third component, E-bill Distribution, will utilize third-party software recently selected by the City. The City is continuing contract negotiations with the selected vendor.</i></p>	
<b>Changes since Last Report</b>	<p><i>Upgrade implemented on September 17, 2012; 13 open defects as of October 10, 2012; no defects are "critical; no defects directly impact customer billing. Water and Revenue Bureaus are continuing to assess implementation schedule for Monthly Billing component.</i></p>	
<b>Current Recommendations</b>	<p><i>Develop acceptance criteria for moving from testing to training for monthly billing component. Finalize implementation schedule and work plan.</i></p>	
<b>Status of Prior Recommendations</b>	<p><i>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 - <b>issue closed</b>; 2) An integrated, resource-loaded project plan should be prepared covering all three project components - Project Sponsor and Project Manager should finalize plan; 3) Weekly planning meetings should be instituted between the Project Manager and the Water Bureau (July 2012) - Meetings are being held weekly - <b>issue closed</b>; 4) User training materials for upgrade (August 2012) - Completed - <b>issue closed</b>; 5) Cost analysis for e-bill distribution completed and approved by Bureau Director and Commissioner (August 2012) - <b>issue closed</b>; 6) Criteria for QRMS production - <b>no action</b>; 7) Update Risk Log - <b>Complete - issue closed</b>.</i></p>	
<b>Individuals Interviewed/Dates</b>	<p><i>Julie Shervey, Technical Project Manager (Revenue Bureau) 9/17/12; Kathy Koch, Project Sponsor (Water Bureau) 10/15/12; Marci Reese, Billing Supervisor (Water Bureau) 10/15/12; Robyn Deeb, Project Lead (Revenue Bureau) 10/15/12</i></p>	
<b>Documents Reviewed/Dates</b>	<p><i>Documents reviewed: Risk Log Update (10/15/12); Project Work Plan ( 10/2/2012) ; project weekly status reports (9/27/2012, 10/5/2012); October TOC Project Status report (9/4/2012)</i></p>	
<b>Meetings Attended/Dates</b>		

<b>Assessment Area</b>	<b>Risk Management - R</b>	<b>Reporting Date: October 16, 2012</b>
<b>Description</b>	A Risk Management assessment by which the Contractor evaluates the effectiveness of the risk management strategy and planning for the project.	
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Yellow</b>	Project needs an approved Risk Management Plan by which to assess the risk identification and
<b>Overall Trend</b>	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	Deteriorating
<b>Overall Score</b>	Calculated	<b>3.3</b>
<b>Reporting Summary</b>	Acceptance criteria for the QRMS implementation (criteria to move to user testing) should be developed.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	The project Risk Log, updated in September 2012, should be reviewed monthly by the Project Sponsor and Project Manager.	

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?					3		The Project Team reports that the Risk Log has been updated; PCG has reviewed the updates.
R2- As risks are encountered are they being confronted in a timely manner to determine a proper response strategy?					3		The Project Sponsor and Project Manager should review the Risk Log at least monthly to confirm mitigation strategies.
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so, how frequently?					3		Thirteen defects with production upgrade have been identified - none critical. Nine of the defects are included in October and November development calendar from Cayenta.
R4- Is the project experiencing variances from budget baselines? Are significant cost overruns occurring? Have significant milestones been missed? If so, how frequently?					2		Delays related to upgrade and monthly billing components are increasing costs; change order has been submitted by Cayenta.
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?					2		Criteria for moving from testing 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 historically late in providing defect corrections; as of 10/10/2012, 13 production defects have been identified with the upgrade - none critical.
R8- Are the projects human resources appropriately skilled and prepared for the project?					4		City team has significant experience with Cayenta product. New BTS resources assigned to develop web interface component for monthly billing.
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 10/10/2012, thirteen production defects have been identified with the upgrade - none critical.

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - PR	Reporting Date: October 16, 2012
<b>Description</b>	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.	
<b>Overall Rating</b>	Yellow	
<b>Overall Trend</b>	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	Deteriorating
<b>Overall Score</b>	Calculated	2.7
<b>Reporting Summary</b>	Cayenta and BTS software delivery is scheduled for 11/1/2012.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	Integrated project work plan should be formally confirmed by Project Sponsor and Project Manager. Financial impacts of delays should be analyzed and approved by management.	

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?					2		Water and Revenue Bureaus should document milestone criteria for proceeding from testing activity to user training for monthly billing implementation.
PR2- Have all business, functional and technical requirements been clearly documented and prioritized by stakeholders?	Yes				4		Requirements for the monthly billing component have been delivered to Cayenta and BTS. A November 1 delivery date is confirmed with both groups.
PR3- Does the project have a realistic timeline based on a work breakdown structure analysis of required activities?					1		Draft project plan delivered on September 27, 2012; Project Sponsor and Project Manager should finalize schedule.
PR4 – Does the project have a realistic budget? Are adequate financial resources available to accomplish the projects goals?					3		Budget impacts to delays in both the upgrade and monthly billing component are now likely. A change order has been received from Cayenta.
PR5 – Does the project plan contain all tasks required to successfully deliver the project?					1		Draft project plan delivered on September 27, 2012; Project Sponsor and Project Manager should finalize schedule.
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?					1		Draft project plan delivered September 27, 2012; Project Sponsor and Project Manager should finalize schedule.
PR7- Does the project have a formal Change Management Plan? Are changes to scope following these processes?	Yes				4		A Change Management Plan exists. The Project Team is working with the Water Bureau to further define the change management impacts for the monthly billing component.
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?					2		Draft project plan delivered September 27, 2012; Project Sponsor and Project Manager should finalize 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: October 16, 2012
<b>Description</b>	<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>	
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Yellow</b>	
<b>Overall Trend</b>	<i>Improving/Deteriorating/Static</i>	<i>Deteriorating</i>
<b>Overall Score</b>	<i>Calculated</i>	<b>3.9</b>
<b>Reporting Summary</b>	<i>Project Sponsor and Project Manager should adopt implementation work plan for monthly billing component.</i>	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<i>Complete integrated project plan for monthly billing component..</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?					3		Budget impacts to delays in both the upgrade and monthly billing component are now likely. A change order has been received from Cayenta.
PM5 – Is the project experiencing negative impacts due to unresolved issues?					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.
PM8 – Has turnover occurred on key roles such as the PM, Sponsor, Steering Committee or leads? If so, are transitions being managed properly?					5		City turnover has not occurred.
PM9 – Are accepted industry best practices for project management being followed?					2		Several project management practices are in place today. The Project Sponsor and Project Manager should adopt a revised implementation work plan for monthly billing. A work plan for E-bill Distribution will need to be developed following contract execution.
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.

<b>Assessment Area</b>	<b>Product Deliverables - PD</b>	<b>Reporting Date: October 16, 2012</b>
<b>Description</b>	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.	
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<b>Yellow</b>	Monthly Billing component will require extensive testing and verification. User training and change management, particularly for collection processes, will need to be developed.
<b>Overall Trend</b>	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	Static
<b>Overall Score</b>	Calculated	3.6
<b>Reporting Summary</b>	Cayenta software delivery as been frequently late or incomplete. New software components will be developed by BTS for web services using new City staff.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	Specific criteria for moving from testing activities to user training should be developed for Monthly Billing component	

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?					2	↓	Overall project criteria is documented. Water and Revenue Bureaus have developed criteria for moving from testing to user training of the monthly billing component.
PD2 - Is the vendor performing according to contract terms? Are they responsive to issues?					4	↔	The contract with Cayenta for QRMS does not have specific delivery dates nor overall City implementation dates for the software . There are currently no "critical" defects for the software upgrade component.
PD3 - Are the vendor's methodologies and work processes compatible with the City standards and best practices?					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?					4	↔	The vendor's scope is well managed; vendor schedule delivery has been late. Cayenta delivery for monthly billing has been rescheduled to November 1, 2012 to parallel development work by BTS,
PD5 - Are the vendors demonstrating best practice quality assurance processes and controls in the development of deliverables?					4	↔	The final software quality as delivered is good.
PD6 - Are deliverables being provided that meet the business need and are fit for use?					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?					4	↔	Cayenta software documentation could be improved.
PD8 - Is proper training, knowledge transfer and documentation accompanying all vendor deliverables?					4	↔	Cayenta staff continues to work 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?					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?					4	↔	Scope and functionality can be achieved. Schedule for monthly billing needs to be confirmed based on scheduled software delivery from Cayenta (and BTS).