

Project Title	Information Technology Advancement Project (ITAP)	Reporting Date: February 4, 2013
Quality Assurance Executive Summary		
Authored by:	David Sharon, Principal Quality Assurance Consultant	
Overall Rating	GREEN	
Overall Trend	GOOD with Comprehensive Planning	<i>Prior report Overall Score was 4.57</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	4.566666667
Risk Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.3
Project Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.5
Project Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.9
Product Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	0
Reporting Summary	<p>There are no significant changes since the last TOC QA Reports submitted on January 17. The Project Team is involved in preparing for and conducting negotiation sessions with Team Sierra. CAI recommends that the TOC discuss and decide what reporting is appropriate during the Procurement, Acquisition, and Negotiation Phases of a project. The metrics on the following pages are for assessing a project in the development, implementation and deployment phases. On December 12, 2012, the City Council supported recommendation to execute a contract with Sierra Systems and its subcontractors: Infor Hansen and Avolve Project Docs . Sierra Systems, Infor Hansen and Avolve Project Docs are called Team Sierra. The first two meetings with Team Sierra occurred December 20 and January 10. In these initial meetings the City and Team Sierra reviewed the City's readiness plans, the contract's structure, and the City's proposed Statement of Work (SOW) and project management plans. CAI reviewed the ITAP draft Statement of Work and provided</p>	

<p>Changes since last report</p>	<p>This is the eleventh (11th) TOC QA report. The schedule for completing the Procurement/Acquisition Phase has adjusted because of the updates to the ITAP Business Case, the schedule for submitting the recommendation to City Council and conducting the initial meetings with Team Sierra (See Reporting Summary above). The ITAP Project Managers and the City's Procurement Office determined ITAP Negotiation Team membership. A tentative negotiation schedule has been developed along with the general topic areas areas for contact negotiation. CAI prepared a draft Quality Assurance Management Plan that will be reviewed at the ITAP QA Kickoff Meeting Tuesday January 22. The City specified that it needs separate contracts with each vendor (Sierra Systems, Avolve, and infor Hansen). CAI is concerned how Sierra Systems will be held accountable for Team Sierra's performance and how Sierra System's can be responsible for paying its subcontractor's, Hansen and Avolve.</p>
<p>Current Recommendations</p>	<p>1. Continue working on the project readiness tasks, 2. Resolve/determine how the contract with Sierra Systems will hold them accountable for the performance of Team Sierra. 3. Further refine the Business Case with a financial analysis and cost/benefits analysis based on feedback from the TOC and CAI. The cost/benefit analysis needs to emphasize the benefits for both the customer and BDS (tangible & intangible, objective and subjective) and show a reasonable payback period and return on investment. 4. Prepare for and conduct negotiation sessions with Team Sierra and prepare thorough minutes/notes of each session.</p>
<p>Status of Prior Recommendations</p>	<p>The City determined the ITAP negotiation team membership. A tentative negotiation schedule has been prepared along with items to be discussed. The initial discussions took place December 20 and January 10. Because of the Christmas Holidays, the further refinement of the Business Case will start in January. CAI met with Ross on January 18 to plan the process.</p>
<p>Individuals Interviewed/Dates</p>	<p>Ross Caron with numerous emails and phone conversations about the Statement of Work. Ross Caron and Richard Appleyard on January 31.</p>

Documents Reviewed/Dates	ITAP Statement of Work reviewed January 4, 2013. On January 15 - 17 reviewed the following: 1) ITAP Staffing Update, 2) ITAP Contract Negotiation Team & Schedule, 3) ITAP System Hosting Workgroup goals, 4) ITAP Data Cleanup Workgroup goals, 5) BDS GIS/ITAP Workgroup goals and 6) the ITAP Issue Management Meetings - Status. An updated Issue Management Status Report was provided to CAI on January 31 along with the ITAP Contract Negotiation Action Items and Timeline.
Meetings Attended/Dates	A meeting January 18 with Ross Caron to review CAI's draft Quality Assurance Management Plan. ITAP QA Kickoff Meeting January 22. A meeting January 31 to discuss project status with Ross Caron and Richard Appleyard.

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R	Reporting Date: February 4, 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	GREEN	
Overall Trend	Good	Prior report score was 4.3
Overall Score	Calculated	4.3
Reporting Summary	<p>No change since the previous report except for Recommendation #3 below. The Project Sponsor, BDS Director Scarlett and Commissioner Saltzman approved the Sierra Systems' proposal and the updated the Business Case and asked the City's Chief Procurement Officer to recommend that Council authorize contract execution with Sierra Systems. The City Council gave its support and authorization on 12/12/2012. The ITAP Team has done the right things to ensure that 1) the selected vendor best meets the City's requirements and 2) the final pricing by the top scoring vendor is appropriately reviewed and approved. The ITAP Team has started the negotiation preparation and planning process. The first meetings with Team Sierra occurred December 20 and January 10. The City specified that it needs separate contracts with each vendor (Sierra Systems, Avolve, and Infor Hansen). CAI is concerned how Sierra Systems will be held accountable for Team Sierra's performance and how Sierra System's can be responsible for paying its subcontractor's, Hansen and Avolve.</p>	
Recommendations	<p>1. Determine how Sierra Systems can be held accountable for the performance of Team Sierra if the City needs to have separate contracts with each vendor. 2. Refine the cost/benefits analysis in the ITAP Business Case. 3. Conduct negotiation sessions with Team Sierra per the schedule and prepare thorough session minutes/notes.</p>	

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?					5	⇔	A Risk Management Plan has been prepared by the Project Controller. The Risk Log is updated with risk rankings based on the impact to the project and probability of occurring,
R2- As risks are encountered are they being confronted in a timely manner to determine a proper response strategy?					5	⇔	The City's CPO recommended that City Council authorize the execution of the contract with Sierra Systems. The Council approved the recommendation December 12, 2012.
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?		YES			4	↑	Project rebaselined when the RFP was started. The plan was to have the contract in place by Oct. 1, 2012. Contract negotiation started December 20 based on authorization by City Council. A master project schedule should result from the contract negotiations.
R4- Is the project experiencing variances from budget baselines? Are significant cost overruns occurring? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?		YES			3	↑	The cost for the Implementation Phase is higher than the cost presented in the enabling ordinance. The City's CPO recommended that the City Council authorize the execution of the contract with Sierra Systems. Based on the authorization from Council, the project cost will be finalized during contract negotiations. The cost/benefit analysis in the ITAP Business Case will be updated.
R5 – Are stakeholders engaged and aligned on project roles, authority and outcomes?	YES				5	⇔	YES

R6 – Do business and technology leadership have shared expectations for urgency and priority?	Issues exists				4	↑	Business Process Mapping has been completed. The to-be model will be compared to the COTS workflow. Major issues have been documented. The expectation is to have these issues resolved prior to the start of the Implementation Phase. These issues affect how the City's business processes are defined in the vendor's product. As of January 31, 2013 12 of the 20 issues have been resolved.
R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider's team or approach?		YES			3	↑	Contract negotiation began December 20 based on the authorization by City Council. A Tentative negotiation schedule and plan have been prepared. The City has stated that it needs separate contracts with the Team Sierra vendors. CAI is concerned how Sierra Systems will be held accountable for Team Sierra's performance and how Sierra System's can be responsible for paying its subcontractor's, Hanson and Avolve.
R8- Are the projects human resources appropriately skilled and prepared for the project?	YES				5	↑	The contracted Project Controller has prepared the planning readiness documentation and is available to maintain the plans and to create and maintain the project schedule. An ITAP Staff Resource Plan has been prepared.
R9 – Are technology risk being addressed and planned for?	YES				5	↔	YES - in the RFP, proposal evaluation and scoring, and contract negotiations.
R10 – Are factors external to the project negatively influencing the project team's ability to succeed?	NO				4	↑	No negative influences are known at this time.

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - ITAP	Reporting Date: February 4, 2013
Description	A Verification of Project Deliverables by which the Contractor evaluators if deliverables are appropriately scoped and detailed with respective to the current phase, included but not limited to: Project Management Plan, Change Management, Project Budget, Project Schedule and Project Communications.	
Overall Rating	Green	
Overall Trend	Very Good	Prior report score was 4.5
Overall Score	Calculated	4.5
Reporting Summary	<p>No change since the previous report except for Recommendation 3 below. The project readiness documentation for the contract negotiations and implementation phase was completed by the Project Controller. The ITAP Team has prepared an updated Business Case because of proposed costs were higher than the originating ordinance. The Project Sponsor, BDS Director Scarlett, and Commissioner Saltzman have approved the Business Case and asked the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) to recommend that the City Council Council authorize the execution of the contract with Sierra Systems. Authorization was granted on December 12, 2012. CAI reviewed the ITAP draft Statement of Work developed by the ITAP Project Team. The ITAP Project Team prepared the Statement of Work for contract negotiations , an ITAP Project Staffing Plan and the goals, plans, accomplishments, and specific objectives of the Project Readiness Workgroups.</p>	
Recommendations	<p>1. Complete the project's statement of work. 2. Complete he negotiation strategy and readiness tasks. 3. Conduct negotiation sessions with Team Sierra and prepare thorough session minutes/notes.</p>	

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?		Almost			3	↑	The Business Case has been updated - See the Executive Summary and Risk Management assessment templates. The Business Case will be further updated to include the feedback from the TOC and CAI.

PR2- Have all business, functional and technical requirements been clearly documented and prioritized by stakeholders?	YES				5	⇔	YES - in the RFP
PR3- Does the project have a realistic timeline based on a work breakdown structure analysis of required activities?	YES				5	⇔	YES for the Procurement/Acquisition and Readiness Phase. The master schedule will be developed after the vendor is selected.
PR4 – Does the project have a realistic budget? Are adequate financial resources available to accomplish the projects goals?	YES				5	⇔	YES for the Procurement/Acquisition and Readiness Phase. As a result of the BAFO, the ITAP Business Case was updated. The City's CPO recommended that the City Council authorize the execution of the contract with Sierra Systems. The authorization was granted on December 12, 2012.
PR5 – Does the project plan contain all tasks required to successfully deliver the project?		Partially			3	⇔	YES for the Procurement/Acquisition and Readiness Phase. ITAP has a high-level Plan. A detailed Master Project Plan and Project Management Plan will be developed when the contract with Sierra Systems is finalized.
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?	YES				4	↑	The schedule and budget plan are reasonable for a project this size. The schedule for the Acquisition/Procurement Phase has been updated. A Contingency Plan is being considered in case the negotiations with the Sierra Systems fail.
PR7- Does the project have a formal Change Management Plan? Are changes to scope following these processes?	YES				5	⇔	A Change Management Plan has been prepared by the Project Controller.
PR8 – Are communications on the project happening in a timely manner to the right audiences?	YES				5	⇔	YES per the Communications Plan
PR9 – Is the Project Manager actively managing schedule and tasks? Is the project plan up to date and accurately reflect project scope?	YES				5	⇔	YES

PR10 – Is the Project Manager taking appropriate action in response to the occurrence issues and risks?

YES

5



YES

Assessment Area	Project Management - ITAP	Reporting Date: February 4, 2013
Description	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.	
Overall Rating	Green	
Overall Trend	Excellent	Prior report score was 4.9
Overall Score	Calculated	4.9
Reporting Summary	<p>No change since the previous report except for Recommendation #4 below. Project Management has been effective during the Procurement/Acquisition Phase. Project management has focused on preparing for contract negotiations and project readiness for the Implementation Phase. The ITAP Team prepared an ITAP draft Statement of Work. The SOW was sent to Team Sierra. CASE Associates Inc. has been asked by ITAP Project Management to help further refine the Business Case in order to anticipate any future questions or concerns expressed, to address the recommendations of the TOC and to provide a Business Case model for other large City projects. The ITAP cost/benefits analysis is the essential part of the Business Case. CAI prepared a draft Quality Assurance Management Plan that will be reviewed at the ITAP QA Kickoff Meeting Tuesday January 22.</p>	
Recommendations	<p>1. Complete the Business Case refinements that explain the project's costs and benefits. 2. Finalize the Contract Negotiation Planning. 3. Complete the project readiness tasks. 4. Conduct contract negotiation sessions with Team Sierra and prepare thorough session minutes/notes.</p>	

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	↕ ↔ ↕ ↔	YES

PM2-Are all project roles and responsibilities clearly defined and assigned?	YES				5	↔	YES for the Procurement/Acquisition and Readiness Phase. Assignments will be updated based on the Master Project Plan and the Project Management Plan.
PM3- Is the City effectively leveraging its contractual authority to resolve issues with vendors and subcontractors?	YES				5	↔	YES -so far. See R7. CAI's concern has been expressed to Scott Schneider for resolution.
PM4 – Are the Project Manager, Sponsor and Steering Committee heeding project warning signs and effectively managing risk?	YES				5	↔	YES - A draft Issue and Risk Management Plan has been prepared and a Risk Log is updated monthly.
PM5 – Is the project experiencing negative impacts due to unresolved issues?		Some Issues remain			4	↑	The Project Sponsor, BDS Director Scarlett, and Commissioner Saltzman approved the Business Case and Sierra Systems' proposal (see the Executive Summary). The major issues identified during the Business Process mapping activity are documented and being resolved. As of January 17, 12 of the 20 issues have been resolved.
PM6 – Are business units and end users involved and participating as stakeholder in the project outcomes?	YES				5	↔	YES per the Business Process Review Plan, the Communications Plans and the Project Readiness Workgroup Plans.
PM7 – Is the City properly prepared for the organizational and cultural changes that the project will affect?	YES				5	↔	YES per the Business Process Review Plan and the Communications and Outreach Plan.
PM8 – Has turnover occurred on key roles such as the PM, Sponsor, Steering Committee or leads? If so, are transitions being managed properly?	No				5	↔	The ITAP has been stable.
PM9 – Are accepted industry best practices for project management being followed?	YES				5	↔	QA will ensure best practices are being followed

PM10 – Does the project team have confidence that the project goals are obtainable given the project scope, budget and timeline?	YES				5		YES - the Project Sponsor and Commissioner approved the project costs and the updated Business case. The Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) recommended that the City Council Council authorize the execution of the contract with Sierra Systems. Authorization was granted December 12, 2012. Contract negotiations started December 20.
--	------------	--	--	--	---	---	--

Assessment Area	Product Deliverables - ITAP	Reporting Date: February 4, 2013
Description	<i>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.</i>	
Overall Rating	<i>Not Applicable at this time</i>	<i>(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)</i>
Overall Trend	<i>STATIC</i>	<i>(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	0
Reporting Summary	<i>This matrix does not apply. The vendor oncontract negotiations have recently started+B6.</i>	
Recommendations	<i>NONE - NA</i>	

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?				NA	0		
PD2- Is the vendor performing according to contract terms? Are they responsive to issues?				NA	0		
PD3 - Are the vendor's methodologies and work processes compatible with the City standards and best practices?				NA	0		
PD4 - Is the vendor showing discipline and diligence to reduce the impacts of change to the project and agreed upon scopes of work?				NA	0		

PD5 - Are the vendors demonstrating best practice quality assurance processes and controls in the development of deliverables?				NA	0		
PD6 - Are deliverables being provided that meet the business need and are fit for use?				NA	0		
PD7 – Are deliverables provided of quality that meets or exceeds City requirements?				NA	0		
PD8 - Is proper training, knowledge transfer and documentation accompanying all vendor deliverables?				NA	0		
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?				NA	0		
PD10 – Does the project manager have confidence that the vendor is able and committed to deliver the project on schedule with required scope?				NA	0		