

Project Title	Enterprise Network Technology Refresh Project	3/4/2013
Quality Assurance Executive Summary		
Authored by:	<i>Clifford Smith, PMP Case Associates, Inc.</i>	
Overall Rating	Green	
Overall Trend	<i>Steady</i>	<i>Prior report rating: 4.7</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	4.7
Risk Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.6
Project Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.7
Project Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.8
Product Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.7
Reporting Summary	<p><i>The Enterprise Network Technology Refresh project is an infrastructure project. Through the life of the project, the TOC can expect schedule changes as the project team adjusts to other end-user-facing projects and emergency support incidents.</i></p> <p><i>The project objectives are clearly defined in initiating documents, including the Business Case, the Charter and elaborated in the schedule.</i></p> <p><i>The schedule is duration based and does not include effort estimates. The project is finding budget savings as it procures equipment. However, those savings were offset by \$100K in unexpected expenses.</i></p> <p><i>The PM is monitoring the project with a schedule with shorter tasks that facilitate progress monitoring.</i></p> <p><i>The project team is well-skilled and is working together well.</i></p>	
Changes since last report	<p><i>The Enterprise Network Technology Refresh project has been working with other projects in the COP. In recent months, some tasks have shifted due to dependencies on those other projects. To date, these delays have not affected the project completion date. The project expects some issues with external dependencies (other projects) to be resolved and that firm dates for some tasks can be set.</i></p> <p><i>The project team has been installing equipment and has encountered no problems that affect network performance.</i></p> <p><i>The team has been working off hours to complete this project. Nevertheless the team remains committed and morale is high.</i></p>	
Current Recommendations	<i>QA and the Project Manager should do a cross-walk through the budget and schedule to validate the expenditures and remaining budget.</i>	
Status of Prior Recommendations	<p><i>The project broke down the schedule to include more and smaller tasks that will be easier to track.</i></p> <p><i>The Project Manager works the Risk list at Steering meetings, team meetings, and one-on-one with the risk owner as needed.</i></p>	
Individuals Interviewed/Dates	<i>Maureen Kinzel-Grubbs, Project Manager 12/8/12, 1/8/13, 1/16/13, 1/29/13, 2/29/13</i>	
Documents Reviewed/Dates	<p><i>TOC Report 2012 11 06 Enterprise Network Technology Refresh Project report (QA Report)</i></p> <p><i>Steering Committee Enterprise Network Tech Refresh Project 02-21-13 (minutes)</i></p> <p><i>Steering Committee Enterprise Network Tech Refresh Project 01-17-13</i></p> <p><i>Steering Committee Enterprise Network Tech Refresh Project 12-11-12</i></p> <p><i>Steering Committee Enterprise Network Tech Refresh Project 11-15-12</i></p> <p><i>Enterprise Network Technology Refresh Project Team minutes 02-28-13 (minutes)</i></p> <p><i>Enterprise Network Technology Refresh Project Team minutes 01-16-13</i></p> <p><i>Enterprise Network Technology Refresh Project Team minutes 12-05-12</i></p> <p><i>Enterprise Network Technology Refresh project plan 02-27-13 (MS/Project file)</i></p> <p><i>Enterprise Network Technology Refresh project plan 01-07-13</i></p> <p><i>Enterprise Network Technology Refresh project plan 10-01-12</i></p> <p><i>Enterprise Network Tech Refresh TOC December 2012 (PM's report to the TOC)</i></p> <p><i>Enterprise Network Technology Refresh Project Risk Management Plan</i></p> <p><i>Enterprise Network Technology Refresh Project Risk Matrix 111512</i></p>	
Meetings Attended/Dates	<p><i>TOC Presentation 11/19/12, 3/18/13</i></p> <p><i>Project Steering Meeting 2/21/13</i></p> <p><i>Project Team Meeting 1/16/13, 2/29/13, 3/13/13</i></p>	

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R		3/4/2013
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	Steady	Prior report rating: 4.4	
Overall Score	Calculated	4.6	
Reporting Summary	<p>The rating for this sheet increased by .2 from the prior report.</p> <p>R4 increased because there have been no new budget increases since the last report and no more are expected. R10 remains the same: a "4". Though the team encounters obstacles, it is actively working on them with other projects. This project has adjusted dates according to external dependencies on those other projects.</p>		
Recommendations	QA and the Project Manager should do a cross-walk through the budget and schedule to validate the expenditures and remaining budget.		

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?	YES	In Progress	NO		5	↔	The team has a Risk Management Plan that is similar to other projects of similar size and scope.
R2- As risks are encountered are they being confronted in a timely manner to determine a proper response strategy?	YES	Partially	NO		5	↔	The team plans for risks. The team identifies appropriate mitigation and avoidance strategies. The reviews the Risk Matrix in project team meetings.
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?	Minor	Minor	YES		4	↔	The project schedule changed since the last report. As of the prior QA report, most changes were due to more detailed planning. As of this report, changes are due to external dependencies. For instance, the project is working with the P-series team to finalize task dates. Also, this project has some dependencies on the HNAS and VM-ware projects. The project changed some dates due to equipment delivery delays. The delays for the 48-port switches caused the project to move some dates so they could complete installation of the available equipment while waiting for the delayed 48-port switches. Schedule variances have been minor. External dependencies with other projects should be worked out by the next report. Overall the scheduled project completion date has not changed.
R4- Is the project experiencing variances from budget baselines? Are significant cost overruns occurring? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?	NO	Minor	YES		5	↑	The project is on budget, perhaps below budget.
R5 – Are stakeholders engaged and aligned on project roles, authority and outcomes?	YES	Partially	NO		4	↔	The Project Sponsor is engaged and supportive. Team members are active and enthusiastic. The project is engaging other stakeholders to determine dependencies and potential conflicts.
R6 – Do business and technology leadership have shared expectations for urgency and priority?	YES	Partially	NO		0		Project is for technical infrastructure upgrade. No changes for Business processes. Though the project is important, do not expect business leaders to share urgency.
R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider's team or approach?	Minor	Minor	YES		4	↔	The City is the solution provider on this project. Staffing levels, availability, and turnover are all risks and are identified in the Risk List.
R8- Are the projects human resources appropriately skilled and prepared for the project?	YES	In Progress	NO		5	↔	Project leadership is experienced. Project oversight is engaged. Project team is skilled for tasks. Tasks are identified in the schedule.
R9 – Are technology risks being addressed and planned for?	YES	Partially	NO		5	↔	Technical risks are identified in the Charter, and carried forward to the Risk Matrix as appropriate. The team is actively identifying and addressing project risks. The project will install Cisco equipment. This reduces risk of incompatibility issues.
R10 – Are factors external to the project negatively influencing the project team's ability to succeed?	Minor	Minor	YES		4	↔	There are numerous other infrastructure projects under way at COP. BTS was developing project interdependencies so they can be accounted for in the project schedules. That process is stopped. Now the project is working with other projects (P-series, HNAS, and VM-Ware) to identify dependencies and refine the schedule. Task dates have changed, though the project completion date remains the same.

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - PR	3/4/2013
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	Green	
Overall Trend	Steady	Prior report rating: 4.6
Overall Score	Calculated	4.7
Reporting Summary	<p>The rating for this sheet increased by .1 from the last report.</p> <p>PR4 increased because the project incurred no new cost overruns since the last report. All other factors remained the same.</p> <p>The project objectives are clearly defined in initiating documents, including the Business Case, the Charter and elaborated in the schedule.</p> <p>The schedule is duration based and does not include effort estimates.</p> <p>The project continues to adapt to external dependencies. The project changed some task dates due to equipment vendor delivery delays. Other tasks changed due to external dependencies on other COP projects, such as P-series, VM-Ware, and HNAS. So far, these changes have not changed the scheduled project completion date.</p>	
Recommendations	The project team is working with other projects to establish reliable external dependencies. They should continue this process.	

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	In Progress	NO		5	⇔	The Business Case is clear and detailed.
PR2- Have all business, functional and technical requirements been clearly documented and prioritized by stakeholders?	YES	In Progress	NO		5	⇔	
PR3- Does the project have a realistic timeline based on a work breakdown structure analysis of required activities?	YES	In Progress	NO		5	⇔	The timeline was cooperatively developed by the project manager, technical lead and the project team. All are comfortable with the timeline. The team collaborates on all schedule changes as they adapt to changing external dependencies.
PR4 – Does the project have a realistic budget? Are adequate financial resources available to accomplish the projects goals?	YES	Partially	NO		4	↑	The project has a budget for equipment procurement. The budget is supported by cost estimates from the Technical Lead. The project does not have a budget for staff labor. Staff costs will be absorbed by the general fund. The project incurred no cost overruns since the last report.
PR5 – Does the project plan contain all tasks required to successfully deliver the project?	YES	Partially	NO		4	⇔	The project team collectively created the schedule. They are confident in their ability to complete the tasks. The schedule includes task durations and assignments. It does not include estimated effort.
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?	YES	Partially	NO		4	⇔	The overall schedule is realistic. It is duration based and does not include effort estimates. Cost estimates apply only to equipment procurement. These estimates are supported by estimates from the Technical Lead. The project is adapting to external dependencies from other projects as well as delayed equipment deliveries. These external dependencies have not changed the scheduled project completion date.
PR7- Does the project have a formal Change Management Plan? Are changes to scope following these processes?	YES	In Progress	NO		5	⇔	BTS has a standard Change Management plan, including forms. No changes of scope have yet been identified.
PR8 – Are communications on the project happening in a timely manner to the right audiences?	YES	Partially	NO		5	⇔	Communication is appropriate for this project.
PR9 – Is the Project Manager actively managing schedule and tasks? Is the project plan up to date and accurately reflect project scope?	YES	Partially	NO		5	⇔	The Project Manager and the team are finalizing the schedule. All major milestones are incorporated. The team actively manages the schedule in its every-other-week team meetings.
PR10 – Is the Project Manager taking appropriate action in response to the occurrence of issues and risks?	YES	Partially	NO		5	⇔	The Project Manager is actively addressing Issues and Risks.

Assessment Area	Project Management - PM	3/4/2013
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	Improving	Prior report rating: 4.9
Overall Score	Calculated	4.8
Reporting Summary	<p>The rating for this sheet decreased .1 from the prior report.</p> <p>PM3 was not rated in prior reports. The rating of "4" decreased the overall rating for the sheet though no metrics received a decreased rating.</p> <p>The schedule is duration based and does not include effort estimates.</p> <p>Since the last report, the team adjusted some task dates due to external dependencies and equipment delivery delays. The team collaboratively updates the schedule to account for the impact of the external dependencies.</p>	
Recommendations	The project team should proceed as they are. QA has no recommendations for this report.	

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	In Progress	NO		5		Both the Project Manager and Sponsor are experienced.
PM2-Are all project roles and responsibilities clearly defined and assigned?	YES	Partially	NO		5		Team members understand their roles and are working well together.
PM3- Is the City effectively leveraging its contractual authority to resolve issues with vendors and subcontractors?	YES	Partially	NO		4		The city and the vendor worked through delivery delays for the 48-port switches. The vendor delivered the equipment in time so that it did not affect the overall project timeline. (Note: This Metric was not rated in prior reports.)
PM4 – Are the Project Manager, Sponsor and Steering Committee heeding project warning signs and effectively managing risk?	YES	Partially	NO		5		The Project Manager is actively addressing Risks and Issues.
PM5 – Is the project experiencing negative impacts due to unresolved issues?	NO	Minor	YES		5		The team is reacting well to external dependencies.
PM6 – Are business units and end users involved and participating as stakeholder in the project outcomes?	YES	Partially	NO		0		Often in an infrastructure project, business involvement is minimal.
PM7 – Is the City properly prepared for the organizational and cultural changes that the project will affect?	YES	Partially	NO		0		This project will not cause organizational or cultural change.
PM8 – Has turnover occurred on key roles such as the PM, Sponsor, Steering Committee or leads? If so, are transitions being managed properly?	NO	Minor	YES		5		No turnover yet identified.
PM9 – Are accepted industry best practices for project management being followed?	YES	Partially	NO		4		The project is not tracking labor estimates and will not be able to present labor-cost-related success metrics. The team refined the long-duration tasks into shorter tasks. The team collaboratively updates the schedule to account for changes, especially those caused by external dependencies. Budget estimates are for equipment procurement.
PM10 – Does the project team have confidence that the project goals are obtainable given the project scope, budget and timeline?	YES	Partially	NO		5		The project team is confident in that the project goals are achievable within scope and timeline. Project Management is confident that the project is achievable within the budget.

Assessment Area	Product Deliverables - PD	3/4/2013
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	Green	
Overall Trend	Steady	Prior report rating: 5.0
Overall Score	Calculated	4.7
Reporting Summary	<p>The rating for this sheet decreased .3 from the prior report. No metric's scores decreased. Rather, this is the first report for six metrics; two of them are lower than a 5 (both are 4).</p> <p>Equipment installation is under way. There are no reported failures. The project shifted around some tasks to account for delivery delays for the 48-port switches. The vendor delivered the equipment in time so the project would not have to change the overall project timeline.</p> <p>The project team has not yet determined the need for load balancers.</p>	
Recommendations		

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?	YES	In Progress	NO		5		The Core equipment is installed in parallel and monitored. The other equipment is tested when installed. No failures reported. (This was not rated in the prior report.)
PD2- Is the vendor performing according to contract terms? Are they responsive to issues?	YES	Partially	NO		4		The equipment vendor had a delivery delay that caused the project to adjust the schedule. They were responsive to COP's concerns about the delay. COP expects no further delays. (This was not rated in the prior report.)
PD3 - Are the vendor's methodologies and work processes compatible with the City standards and best practices?	YES	Partially	NO		0		
PD4 - Is the vendor showing discipline and diligence to reduce the impacts of change to the project and agreed upon scopes of work?	YES	Partially	NO		0		
PD5 - Are the vendors demonstrating best practice quality assurance processes and controls in the development of deliverables?	YES	Partially	NO		5		There have been no equipment failures either at delivery or installation. (This was not rated in the prior report.)
PD6 - Are deliverables being provided that meet the business need and are fit for use?	YES	Partially	NO		5		The installed equipment is performing as expected. (This was not rated in the prior report.)
PD7 - Are deliverables provided of quality that meets or exceeds City requirements?	YES	Partially	NO		4		The installed equipment is performing as expected for the network data transfer. But the team is having some difficulty with the monitoring processes in the switches. The problem will not delay the project. The team and the vendor are working on the solution. (This was not rated in the prior report.)
PD8 - Is proper training, knowledge transfer and documentation accompanying all vendor deliverables?	YES	Partially	NO		5		Staff is skilled at installation and monitoring of the new equipment. They require no separate training. (This was not rated in the prior report.)
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?	YES	Partially	NO		0		
PD10 - Does the project manager have confidence that the vendor is able and committed to deliver the project on schedule with required scope?	YES	Partially	NO		5		The City and the vendors have long history. Even considering recent delivery delays, the City expects that remaining deliveries will be timely.