

Project Title	Water/Sewer Monthly Billing Project	Reporting Date: January 9, 2013
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>	2.3
Risk Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	2.4
Project Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	1.9
Project Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	3.0
Product Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	1.7
Reporting Summary	<p><i>This is PCG's sixth 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 currently planned for 2Q 2013. The final Cayenta software delivery for monthly billing, received in November, continues to have serious defects. As of our on-site interviews, nine serious defects remain open and corrections for three defects are expected the week of January 7th. The Bureau of Technology Services online registration component has not yet been fully tested but initial testing has been positive. Implementation, still scheduled for mid-April 2013, may be delayed again due to software defects. The project team is working on an updated schedule. The City plans to meet with the E-bill Distribution vendor</i></p>	
Changes since Last Report	<p><i>The monthly billing component implementation, scheduled for mid-April 2013, is continuing to experience serious software defects. Additional schedule delays are very possible.</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 - NOT RESOLVED; 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; 7) Develop acceptance test scenarios for monthly billing; 8) Bureau directors meet with Cayenta management to confirm quality and schedule of software delivery.</i></p>	
Individuals Interviewed/Dates	<p><i>Julie Shervey, Technical Project Manager (Revenue Bureau) 1/7/2013; Kathy Koch, Project Sponsor (Water Bureau) 1/7/2013; Marci Reese, Billing Supervisor (Water Bureau) 1/7/2013; Robyn Deeb, Project Lead (Revenue Bureau) 1/7/2013</i></p>	
Documents Reviewed/Dates	<p><i>Documents reviewed: project weekly status reports (11/30/2012, 12/7/2012, 12/14/2012, 12/21/2012, and 1/4/2013); December 2012 Project Status report (12/11/2012); monthly billing acceptance test plan (1/2/2013).</i></p>	
Meetings Attended/Dates	<p><i>December TOC meeting (12/17/2012)</i></p>	

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R	Reporting Date: January 9, 2013
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	2.4
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 provided an updated risk log on 1/10/2013. New risks related to the BES drainage district's implementation and the winter/summer average changes have been added to the log.
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 has nine open defects (eight critical). Three defect fixes were delivered on 1/8/2013 and are currently in testing.
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?					2		Business team is very concerned with the continued project delays and software defects.
R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider's team or approach?					1		There are nine open defects (eight critical) related to monthly billing. Cayenta has been historically late in providing defect corrections creating significant schedule risk.
R8- Are the projects human resources appropriately skilled and prepared for the project?					3		City team has significant experience with Cayenta product. BTS software deliverable appears successful in initial testing.
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?					1		Cayenta has been late in providing defect corrections. As of 1/7/2013 there are nine defects (eight critical) related to monthly billing that Cayenta must resolve.

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - PR	Reporting Date: January 9, 2013
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	Red	
Overall Trend	<i>Improving/Deteriorating/Static</i>	<i>Deteriorating</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	1.9
Reporting Summary	Cayenta second software delivery, scheduled for December 17, to correct prior defects was not successful. Three defect corrections were received 1/10/2013 and will need thorough testing. There are	
Recommendations	Confirm budget impact of schedule delay. City bureau directors to meet with Cayenta and confirm commitment to delivery software defects ASAP.	

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 for Cayenta 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 delays. Schedule should be updated. Current planned implementation date is in jeopardy.
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?					1		A resource loaded project plan, requested in July, has not been developed.
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?					1		Current schedule is heavily dependent on Cayenta 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?					3		A Change Management Plan exists. The Project Team and the Water Bureau need to work together to confirm confidence in the product and implementation schedule.
PR8 – Are communications on the project happening in a timely manner to the right audiences?					4		Weekly planning meetings are scheduled between the Project Team and the Water Bureau to address implementation issues although over the holidays some meetings were cancelled.
PR9 – Is the Project Manager actively managing schedule and tasks? Is the project plan up to date and accurately reflect project scope?					1		Revised project schedule should be reconfirmed by both Water and Revenue Bureaus. A resource loaded project plan should be prepared.
PR10 – Is the Project Manager taking appropriate action in response to the occurrence issues and risks?					2		Issues are identified and tracked with Cayenta. City bureau directors (Water and Revenue) should meet with Cayenta to review schedule and delivery commitments.

Assessment Area	Project Management - PM	Reporting Date: January 9, 2013
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	
Overall Trend	<i>Improving/Deteriorating/Static</i>	<i>Deteriorating</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	3.0
Reporting Summary	<i>Continued software delays are jeopardizing implementation schedule and user confidence.</i>	
Recommendations	<i>Develop resource-loaded project plan. Bureau directors should meet with Cayenta management ASAP to confirm schedule and quality delivery commitments. Meet with</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?					1		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 ASAP.
PM4 – Are the Project Manager, Sponsor and Steering Committee heeding project warning signs and effectively managing risk?					1		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		Timely and correct defect correction by Cayenta continues to be a serious concern and is delaying implementation of monthly billing component.
PM6 – Are business units and end users involved and participating as stakeholder in the project outcomes?					4		Water and Revenue Bureaus actively engaged with project. Bureau directors should meet with Cayenta to discuss recent schedule delays and poor software quality.
PM7 – Is the City properly prepared for the organizational and cultural changes that the project will affect?					4		A Change Management Plan exists. The Project Team and the Water Bureau need 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?					3		Water Bureau staff is expressing concern with the ability to deliver a workable monthly billing product given repeated schedule delays. Current implementation schedule may be further delayed and will 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: January 9, 2013
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	Red	
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	Static
Overall Score	Calculated	1.7
Reporting Summary	Cayenta monthly billing software delivery as critical defects.	
Recommendations	Bureau directors should meet with Cayenta management ASAP to discuss quality and schedule commitments.	

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 acceptance test plan has been drafted. Detailed test scenarios specific to monthly billing need to be documented and approved by the Water Bureau.
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.
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?					2	↓	Water Bureau staff have expressed concern with meeting project scope and schedule based on continuing software defects and schedule delays. Schedule for monthly billing may be further delayed due to defects in Cayenta software.