

Project Title	Water/Sewer Monthly Billing Project	Reporting Date: April 5, 2013
Quality Assurance Executive Summary		
Authored by:	Pacific Consulting Group, Inc. (PCG)	
Overall Rating	Red	Uncertainty with Cayenta's ability to correct known software defects in a timely manner, which adds significant risk to project schedule.
Schedule Rating	Red	Cayenta can not delivery corrections to 17 known defects until May 31, 2013, which will delay implementation until fall of 2013.
Budget Rating	Yellow	Cayenta has requested a change order to current T&M task order for monthly billing.
Scope Stability Rating	Green	City scope has not changed from July 2012 business requirements for monthly billing component.
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	Deteriorating
Overall Score	Calculated	2.2
Risk Management	Carried from worksheet	2.4
Project Deliverables	Carried from worksheet	1.9
Project Management	Carried from worksheet	2.7
Product Deliverables	Carried from worksheet	1.6
Reporting Summary	<p>This is PCG's ninth 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. Cayenta is currently addressing defects found in their most recent software delivery. They have committed to resolving these defects by May 31, 2013. Interim software patches are anticipated which will allow the project team to conduct some testing. Cayenta proposed an approach to address the City's concerns with their software delivery quality on March 13, 2013. The City is preparing a formal response to Cayenta. An updated project plan with resources should be prepared once the two parties formally agree to new delivery dates.</p>	
Changes since Last Report	None	
Current Recommendations	<p>City management met with Cayenta staff on 3/7/2013 to review their performance and the impact of their delays on the project. Cayenta provided a written proposal on March 13, 2013, to the City. City staff met on March 21, 2013, to decide on a course of action. The City is preparing a formal response to Cayenta.</p>	
Status of Prior Recommendations	<p>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 - issue closed; 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; 8) Develop acceptance test scenarios for monthly billing - in process; 9) Bureau directors meet with Cayenta management to confirm quality and schedule of software delivery - meeting held 3/7/2013 - issue closed; 9) Prepare formal response and appropriate cor</p>	
Individuals Interviewed/Dates	<p>Marci Reese, Billing Supervisor (Water Bureau) 4/5/2013; Robyn Deeb, Project Lead (Revenue Bureau) 4/1/2013; Julie Shervey Technical Project Manager (Revenue Bureau) 4/1/2013; David Shaff (Water Bureau Director), Ben Berry (CTO), Julie Shervey, and Kathy Koch, Project Sponsor (Water Bureau) 3/21/2013; Kathy Koch 4/5/2013.</p>	
Documents Reviewed/Dates	<p>Documents reviewed: project weekly status reports (2/1/2013, 2/8/2013, 2/15/2013, 2/22/2013, and 3/1/2013); Cayenta contract issues document (3/13/2013)</p>	
Meetings Attended/Dates	<p>B. Berry and D Shaff (3/21/2013)</p>	

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R	Reporting Date: April 5, 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	Static
Overall Score	Calculated	2.4
Reporting Summary	Critical Cayenta software defects are seriously impacting project schedule.	
Recommendations	City should finalize a formal response to Cayenta with appropriate contract documents before proceeding.	

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 2/28/2013.
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		As of March 29, 2013, Cayenta has 17 open defects (up from 12 last period). Testing is approximately 85 percent complete.
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		The 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		As of March 29, 2013, Cayenta has 17 open defects (up from 12 last period). 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 so far in initial testing. It appears that staff is short-handed, due to Cayenta delays in addressing defects.
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		As of March 29, 2013, Cayenta has 17 open defects (up from 12 last period). Testing is approximately 85 percent complete.

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - PR	Reporting Date: April 5, 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	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	Deteriorating
Overall Score	Calculated	1.9
Reporting Summary	As of March 29, 17 defects (up from 12 last period) have been identified and scheduled with the Cayenta monthly billing component. Testing is approximately 85 percent complete; additional defects are very likely to be identified.	
Recommendations	Confirm City decision on Cayenta proposal and prepare appropriate contract documents; project schedule update; and revised project budget.	

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?					2		Requirements for the monthly billing component were delivered to Cayenta and BTS in 2012; 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?					2		Project implementation as been delayed until fall of 2013. New updated resource-loaded project plan should be prepared based on latest Cayenta delivery forecast.
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; the City is preparing a response as of the date of our report.
PR5 – Does the project plan contain all tasks required to successfully deliver the project?					2		Updated resource-loaded project plan should be developed based on most recent Cayenta delivery forecast.
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.
PR7- Does the project have a formal Change Management Plan? Are changes to scope following these processes?					2		A Change Management Plan exists; however, business impact of monthly billing is not yet fully known. 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.
PR9 – Is the Project Manager actively managing schedule and tasks? Is the project plan up to date and accurately reflect project scope?					2		Updated resource-loaded project plan should be developed based on most recent Cayenta delivery forecast.
PR10 – Is the Project Manager taking appropriate action in response to the occurrence issues and risks?					1		Issues are identified and tracked with Cayenta. City bureau directors (IT, Water and Revenue) met with Cayenta management on 3/7/2013 to review schedule and delivery commitments; City staff met 3/21/2013 to formulate a response. As of the date of our report, the City is preparing a written response to Cayenta.

Assessment Area	Project Management - PM	Reporting Date: April 5, 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>Static</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	2.7
Reporting Summary	<i>Continued software delays are jeopardizing implementation schedule and user confidence.</i>	
Recommendations	<i>Recommend monthly status meetings involving the Water and Revenue Bureau directors with the project sponsor and project manager to assess project status.</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.
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 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 met with Cayenta on 3/7/2013 to discuss recent schedule delays and poor software quality. Cayenta provide a written proposal on 3/13/2013; City met on 3/21/2013 to determine course of action. The City is preparing a formal response to Cayenta as of the date of our report.
PM7 – Is the City properly prepared for the organizational and cultural changes that the project will affect?					2	↔	A Change Management Plan exists; however, business impact of monthly billing is not yet fully known. The Project Team and the Water Bureau need to work together to confirm confidence in the product and implementation schedule.
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 are meeting weekly to review project status and issues; project risks reviewed monthly. Resource-loaded project plan needs to be updated. Recommend the Water and Revenue Bureau directors meet monthly with the project manager and project sponsor to access the project status.
PM10 – Does the project team have confidence that the project goals are obtainable given the project scope, budget and timeline?					1	↓	No significant progress in last period addressing software defects.

Assessment Area	Product Deliverables - PD	Reporting Date: April 5, 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	1.6
Reporting Summary	Cayenta monthly billing software delivery as critical defects. Testing is approximately two-thirds complete; additional serious defects likely.	
Recommendations	Bureau directors met with Cayenta management on 3/7/2013 to discuss quality and schedule commitments. City is preparing a formal response to Cayenta with appropriate contract documents before proceeding.	

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 are being 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. Implementation will need to be reschedule for fall of 2013. 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	↔	Cayenta software delivery has been late and has 17 defects (up from 12 last period) impacting 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 impacting schedule. Implementation will need to be rescheduled for the fall of 2013.
PD6 - Are deliverables being provided that meet the business need and are fit for use?					1	↔	Most recent software delivery has critical defects impacting schedule. Implementation will need to be rescheduled for the fall of 2013.
PD7 - Are deliverables provided of quality that meets or exceeds City requirements?					1	↔	Most recent software delivery has critical defects impacting schedule. Implementation will need to be rescheduled for the fall of 2013.
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?					2	↔	There are some staff reassignments by Cayenta. Contract does not provide a mechanism to enforce consistent staff assignments. Appears, based on delays in addressing defects, that Cayenta is short-handed and unable to quickly fix defects.
PD10 - Does the project manager have confidence that the vendor is able and committed to deliver the project on schedule with required scope?					2	↔	There continue to be serious questions about Cayenta's ability to deliver the required monthly billing functionality agreed to by the City.