

Project Title	Water/Sewer Monthly Billing Project	Reporting Date: November 21, 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>Deteriorating</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	2.5
Risk Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	2.7
Project Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	2.5
Project Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	2.9
Product Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	2.0
Reporting Summary	<p><i>This is PCG's fifth 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 on 9/17/2012 and is now in a ninety-day stabilization phase. The monthly billing component continues in development status with implementation planned for 2Q 2013. The final Cayenta software delivery for monthly billing has been received in November; however, to date seven defects (including three critical defects) have been identified in initial testing. The Bureau of Technology Services online registration component has been delayed from November 1 to late November. Implementation has been delayed until mid-April 2013. The City has recently signed a contract for the third component, E-bill Distribution, but may delay start of this work until late 2Q 2013.</i></p>	
Changes since Last Report	<p><i>The monthly billing component implementation has been delayed until mid-April 2013 due to critical defects in the Cayenta software.</i></p>	
Current Recommendations	<p><i>City management should meet with Cayenta to review their performance and the impact of their delays on the project.</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 (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 - 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 - 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; 6) Criteria for QRMS production - issue closed; 7) Update Risk Log - issue closed.</i></p>	
Individuals Interviewed/Dates	<p><i>Julie Shervey, Technical Project Manager (Revenue Bureau) 11/15/12; Kathy Koch, Project Sponsor (Water Bureau) 11/15/12; Marci Reese, Billing Supervisor (Water Bureau) 11/20/12; Robyn Deeb, Project Lead (Revenue Bureau) 11/15/12; David Shaff and Thomas Lannom 11/30/2102</i></p>	
Documents Reviewed/Dates	<p><i>Documents reviewed: project weekly status reports (10/19/2012); November TOC Project Status report (11/19/2012); monthly billing acceptance criteria (11/10/2012).</i></p>	
Meetings Attended/Dates		

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R	Reporting Date: November 21, 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	Significant schedule delays due to critical defects with vendor software.
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	Deteriorating
Overall Score	Calculated	2.7
Reporting Summary	Critical Cayenta software defects are seriously impacting project schedule.	
Recommendations	Management should confirm with Cayenta management their commitment to delivery defect corrections by mid-December.	

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 was updated in late September. New risks related to the BES drainage districts implementation and the winter/summer average changes should be assessed.
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 are meeting monthly to review the Risk Log and confirm mitigation strategies.
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so, how frequently?					1	↓	Cayenta November 1 delivery has seven defects (three critical) which will not be addressed until December 14 causing significant schedule delay.
R4- Is the project experiencing variances from budget baselines? Are significant cost overruns occurring? Have significant milestones been missed? If so, how frequently?					1	↓	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?					3	↑	Criteria for moving from testing to user training for monthly billing implementation has been defined by Water Bureau.
R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider’s team or approach?					2	↓	Three critical defects related to monthly billing. Cayenta has been historically late in providing defect corrections creating significant schedule risk. BTS late in delivering online enrollment component.
R8- Are the projects human resources appropriately skilled and prepared for the project?					3	↓	City team has significant experience with Cayenta product. New BTS resource late in delivering online enrollment component.
R9 – Are technology risk being addressed and planned for?	Yes				4	↓	Yes. Risks are being addressed for the 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?					2	↓	Cayenta has been late in providing defect corrections. As of November 15 there are seven defects (three critical) related to monthly billing that Cayenta has committed to deliver by December 14.

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - PR	Reporting Date: November 21, 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	
Overall Trend	<i>Improving/Deteriorating/Static</i>	<i>Deteriorating</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	2.5
Reporting Summary	Cayenta software delivery, scheduled for November 1, identified seven defects (three critical). BTS software delivery, scheduled for November 1 is delayed until late November.	
Recommendations	Confirm budget impact of schedule delay. Confirm Cayenta commitment to delivery software defects by mid-December.	

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 have documented 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?					3		Requirements for the monthly billing component have been delivered to Cayenta and BTS; however, promised delivery dates have not been met creating significant schedule delay.
PR3- Does the project have a realistic timeline based on a work breakdown structure analysis of required activities?					1		Project has been delayed several weeks due to Cayenta and BTS delays. Schedule should be updated.
PR4 – Does the project have a realistic budget? Are adequate financial resources available to accomplish the projects goals?					1		Schedule delays are creating budget impacts. A change order related to the time and materials monthly billing component has been received from Cayenta.
PR5 – Does the project plan contain all tasks required to successfully deliver the project?					2		Revised project plan has been reviewed by Water and Revenue Bureaus.
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?					1		Revised schedule is heavily dependent on both Cayenta and BTS delivering "error-free" code. Cayenta has historically missed critical delivery deadlines impacting overall schedule. Current implementation schedule may impact other operations of Water Bureau (i.e., winter/summer average change, rate increase, BES drainage implementation, etc.).
PR7- Does the project have a formal Change Management Plan? Are changes to scope following these processes?					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?					5		Weekly planning meetings are conducted 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		Revised project schedule with significant delay has been reviewed by both Water and Revenue Bureaus.
PR10 – Is the Project Manager taking appropriate action in response to the occurrence issues and risks?					4		Issues are identified and tracked with Cayenta.

Assessment Area	Project Management - PM	Reporting Date: November 21, 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	Yellow	<i>Project Team and Water Bureau continuing weekly planning meetings to address upgrade and monthly billing issues. Project Sponsor and Project Manager should adopt implementation work plan for monthly billing component. A detailed work plan will need to be developed for E-bill Distribution following contract approval.</i>
Overall Trend	<i>Improving/Deteriorating/Static</i>	<i>Deteriorating</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	2.9
Reporting Summary		
Recommendations	<i>Monitor project schedule on a weekly basis.</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?					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?					5		Project roles and responsibilities are documented and understood.
PM3- Is the City effectively leveraging its contractual authority to resolve issues with vendors and subcontractors?					2		Time and materials contract with Cayenta for monthly billing provides little leverage related to defect correction and schedule delays. Management should contact Cayenta to review current status.
PM4 – Are the Project Manager, Sponsor and Steering Committee heeding project warning signs and effectively managing risk?					2		Budget impacts to delays in monthly billing component are now certain. A change order for time and materials monthly billing contract has been received from Cayenta.
PM5 – Is the project experiencing negative impacts due to unresolved issues?					1		Negative impacts from Cayenta delays that will delay implementation of monthly billing component.
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?					1		Several project management practices are in place today. The Project Sponsor and Project Manager are meeting weekly to review project status and issues; project risks reviewed monthly. The project schedule needs to be updated and individual resources assigned.
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 have been adjusted based on Cayenta software delivery and quality. Current implementation schedule may impact other operations of Water Bureau (i.e., winter/summer average change, rate increase, BES drainage implementation, etc.).

Assessment Area	Product Deliverables - PD	Reporting Date: November 21, 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	Monthly Billing component will require extensive testing and verification. User training and change management, particularly for collection processes, will need to be developed.
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	Static
Overall Score	Calculated	2.0
Reporting Summary	Cayenta monthly billing software delivery as critical defects. BTS delivery of online enrollment software has been delayed until late November.	
Recommendations	Management should discuss software quality and delivery impacts with Cayenta management.	

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?					3	↑	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?					1	↓	The time and materials contract with Cayenta for QRMS does not have specific delivery dates nor overall City implementation dates for the software. Previous Cayenta software delivery for monthly billing has critical defects.
PD3 - Are the vendor's methodologies and work processes compatible with the City standards and best practices?					1	↓	Most recent software delivery has critical defects impact schedule.
PD4 - Is the vendor showing discipline and diligence to reduce the impacts of change to the project and agreed upon scopes of work?					1	↓	The time and materials contract with Cayenta for QRMS does not have specific delivery dates nor overall City implementation dates for the software. Previous Cayenta software delivery for monthly billing has critical defects.
PD5 - Are the vendors demonstrating best practice quality assurance processes and controls in the development of deliverables?					1	↓	Most recent software delivery has critical defects impact schedule.
PD6 - Are deliverables being provided that meet the business need and are fit for use?					1	↓	Most recent software delivery has critical defects impact schedule. Delays in BTS delivery have also impacted testing schedule.
PD7 - Are deliverables provided of quality that meets or exceeds City requirements?					1	↓	Most recent software delivery has critical defects impact schedule.
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?					3	↓	Scope and functionality can be achieved. Schedule for monthly billing has been significantly delayed due to defects in Cayenta software and delivery delays by BTS development staff.