Project Title:	ITAP	Reporting Date: 8/12/2013
Quality Assurance Executive Summary		
Authored by:	*Clifford Smith, PMP* *Case Associates, Inc.*	
Overall Rating	***Yellow***	
Schedule Rating	***Red***	*Acquisition phase was delayed. The Avolve contract is not signed. It may be signed the week of 8/12/13.* *The project is developing a detailed schedule for P1. The schedule requires further refinement (see recommendations).* *Schedule-related metrics assigned red: R3, PR3, PR5, PR6, PM9, PM10.*
Budget Rating	***Yellow***	*Delays to date have not increased costs.* *The vendors are on a fixed-cost plan.* *Partner agencies are responsible for their own costs.* *However, the schedule is likely to increase and this may also be accompanied by cost increases.* *The costs for a new PM are added to current estimates.* *Budget-related metrics assigned red: None.*
Scope Stability Rating	***Yellow***	*The draft plans and sub plans are not yet final. The project is developing a detailed schedule for P1. It requires further refinement including decomposition of long tasks, detail for the Formal Project Plan, and available detail for P2 through P7.* *The Avolve contract signed by the vendor. The COP may sign it the week of 8/12/13.* *Scope-related metrics assigned red: R2, R3.* *(note: In this context, scope is 'how the work is to be accomplished,' as well as product scope.)*
Overall Trend	*Deteriorating*	*The changes in rating colors and number assignments are due to major factors:* *1. Changes to the method to assign numbers and colors.* *2. Increase in urgency for the metrics due to project progress and lack of some planning and monitoring artifacts.* *Prior Report score was 4.8*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**3.6**
Risk Management	*Carried from worksheet*	3.2
Project Deliverables	*Carried from worksheet*	3.0
Project Management	*Carried from worksheet*	3.3
Product Deliverables	*Carried from worksheet*	5.0
Reporting Summary	*This is the seventeenth TOC QA report.* *Last month's report said that the "Procurement and Acquisition Phase is over." However the Avolve contract is not yet signed. The project expects no impact on the Proof of Concept. The contract with Sierra was approved and executed in June.* *Phase 1 (P1) will last through December 2013. The project is developing a schedule for P1. It requires further refinement (see recommendations).* *ITAP has a set of basic plans in draft form, developed late last year. They should all be finalized very soon. The two most critical are the Project Management Plan and the Risk Management Plan. Recommendations to finalize plans and to initiate formal processes are a common theme for the remainder of this report.* *The recruitment of the PM position is under way, though taking longer than planned. The new PM may be on site late August.*	
Changes since last report	*This is the first report with values assigned to metrics in the Product Deliverables Assessment Area. The metrics are all assigned "5." This raised the overall score. Without the new ratings, the overall score would have been "3.2," to be compared with the prior report overall score of "4.8."* *The overall score decrease is due to two main factors:* *1. Changes in the method to assign numbers and colors* *2. Increase in urgency for the metrics due to project progress and lack of some planning and monitoring artifacts.*	
Current Recommendations	*The recommendations are split into four separate rows, one for each of the Assessment Areas.*	
Current Recommendations from Risk Management Assessment Area	*1) Finalize the RMP with description of ITAP RMP activities including joint COP/TM meetings, analysis, and response planning.* *2) Carry "Assumptions" from the charter and PMP forward to the risk list.* *3) Begin formal RM activities such as initial risk capture and response planning.* *4) Finalize a detailed schedule for P1. Include further decomposition of tasks over 10 days duration, detail for the Formal Project Plan, and available detail for P2 through P7.* *5) Recruit a professional project manager to manage the City's ITAP resources and the performance of the vendor to order to manage project risks.*	

Current Recommendations from Project Deliverables Assessment Area	*1) Finalize the Project Management Plan, including a description of how the project manages and reports on the sub-projects such as GIS, and Data Clean-up.* *2) Develop a detailed schedule for P1, including a less detailed schedule for P2 through P7. (duplicate)* *3) Finalize the Change Management Plan to describe Team Sierra and COP activities.* *4) Finalize the Communication Plan to reflect current needs and activities.* *5) Reinstitute regular status reporting with a one- or two-page status report to give interested parties a view into project progress, risks, and issues.* *6) Establish Issues and Decisions logs (can be the same log) to capture decisions and to give visibility to project issues. SharePoint is an excellent venue for such logs.* *7) Finalize the Issues Management Plan to reflect actual COP, Team Sierra, partner agencies, partner bureaus, and other stakeholder activates.*
Current Recommendations from Project Management Assessment Area	*1) Hire a Project Manager. (duplicate)* *2) Finalize draft projects plans, including a detailed P1 schedule with some long-duration tasks decomposed, and more detail for phases P2 through P7. (duplicate)*
Current Recommendations from Product Deliverables Assessment Area	*1) The COP must commit to more timely deliverable review and providing corrections, clarifications, or approval.*
Status of Prior Recommendations	*1) Review the Phase I deliverables from Team Sierra.* *Status: The Engagement Plan is final. The COP is took too long to finalize it.* *2) Recruit and hire a professional IT Project Manager for the project.* *Status: Recruitment is under way, though behind schedule. The new PM may be in place in late August.*
Individuals Interviewed/Dates	*Ross Caron 7/24/2013, 8/6/2013*
Documents Reviewed/Dates Part 1 **(note: MS/Excel does not allow for a display tall enough for this list. For this report, it is presented in two rows)**	*Avolve Software License Services and Maintenance Agreements - 7_8_2013 SS* *Proof_of_Concept_Process_Workflow_Div_Man_Mtg_3 (7/30/2013)* *City of Portland Engagement Plan Deliverable D1 Rev 7-5-2013-1* *City of Portland Engagement Plan Deliverable 1 Rev 2.0 (Final Version)* *Data Cleanup Questionnaire - Final Version (7/30/2013)* *ISO-8859-1"PM Interview Questions R2 7-26-13* *ITAP Project Charter v.1.7 (7/23/2013)* *ITAP Documentation Standard Operating Procedure (7/30/2013)* *ITAP TimeKeeping Standard Operating Procedure (8/10/2013)* *Meeting Notes Standard Operating Procedure(8/10/2013)* *TOC_ITAP_UpdateJuly2013v1 (PM .pptx report to TOC)* *TOC_ITAP_UpdateJuly2013v2* *2013-8-5_Top 20 Issue Resolutions (8/10/2013)* *ITAP WS 07122013 (TS Weekly Status Reports, received and reviewed 8/10/2013)* *ITAP WS 07192013* *ITAP WS 07262013* *ITAP WS 08022013* *ITAP Working Communications Mgt Plan 20130809* *City of Portland Project Schedule 08082013 Rev 2.0 (.pdf of the .mpp)* *City of Portland Project Schedule 08082013 Rev 2.0 2007 (.mpp)* *Process Mapping Improvement 201308 (schedule for mapping)* *2013-08-02_SME Weekly Status Report (Individual sub-project weekly status report)* *2013-08-02_Organizational Change Management* *2013-08-02_GIS Weekly Status Report* *2013-08-02_Data Cleanup Weekly Report* *2013-08-02_City Weekly Report (Roll up of sub project weekly status reports)*
Documents Reviewed/Dates Part 2: Meeting Notes	*ITAP/Sierra Kickoff Meeting minutes June 25, 2013* *2013 06 25 ITAP Kickoff Management Workshop Notes* *2013.07.16 ITAP Division Mngr. Mtg. Notes* *2013.07.16 ITAP Manager Mtg. Notes* *2013.07.23 ITAP Manager Mtg. Notes* *2013.07.23 ITAP Managers Agenda* *2013.07.24 ITAP Team Mtg Notes.* *2013.07.30 ITAP Managers Agenda* *2013-07-30 ITAP Managers Mtg. Notes* *Meeting Agenda Template (7/30/2013)* *Meeting Notes Template (7/30/2013)* *Weekly Status Report Template (7/30/2013)*
Meetings Attended/Dates	*TOC Meeting 7/15/2013* *ITAP Project Managers Meeting 7/16/2013, 7/23/2013, 8/6/2013* *ITAP Teams Meeting 7/24/2013, 8/7/2013* *Avolve Contract Negotiations 7/25/2013* *ITAP Division Managers' Meeting 7/30/2013* *Interview Panel for the Project Manager Recruitment 7/31/2013, 8/2/2013* *Ross Caron and TS Project Director 8/6/2013*

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R	Reporting Date: 8/12/2013
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***	*Five metrics are yellow.* *Two metrics are red. Lack of a final RMP, lack of formal RM activities, lack of a final P1 schedule, and delays of the first P1 deliverable are the primary risks causing the red assignments.*
Overall Trend	*Deteriorating*	*The changes in rating colors and number assignments are due to two major factors:* *1. Changes in the method to assign numbers and colors.* *2. Increase in urgency for the metrics due to project progress and lack of some planning and monitoring artifacts.* *Prior Report score was 4.9*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**3.2**
Reporting Summary	*The changes in rating colors and number assignments are due to major factors:* *1. Changes in the method to assign numbers and colors* *2. Increase in urgency for the metrics due to project progress and lack of some planning and monitoring artifacts.* *The main vendor contracts are in place. The Avolve contract may be signed the week of 8/12/13.* *The project is developing a detailed schedule for P1. Tasks over 10 days duration should be further decomposed to enable project monitoring and control. The formal Project Plan must be further decomposed into the sub deliverables. Available detail should be incorporated for P2 through P7.* *The Team Sierra Engagement Plan is now final.* *To date, delays have not caused cost increases.* *The Sandbox process is proceeding, the Avolve contract delays are not expected to impact the scope of the Proof of Concept.* *The project is receiving excellent sponsorship and stakeholder participation.*	
Recommendations	*1) Finalize the RMP with description of ITAP RMP activities including joint COP/TM meetings, analysis, and response planning.* *2) Carry "Assumptions" from the charter and PMP forward to the risk list.* *3) Begin formal RM activities such as initial risk capture and response planning.* *4) Finalize a detailed schedule for P1. Include further decomposition of tasks over 10 days duration, detail for the Formal Project Plan, and available detail for P2 through P7.* *5) Recruit a professional project manager to manage the City's ITAP resources and the performance of the vendor to order to manage project risks.*	

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	Partially	No		3	⇩	The Risk Management Plan is a draft document that was written by a contractor in October 2012. The RMP has extensive explanations of RM. But it includes very little description of ITAP RM activities. Now that Team Sierra is on board, the plan should be finalized with an explanation of individual roles, meetings, risk capture, analysis, and response strategies. The initial risk list should include the assumptions from the Charter. These assumptions are also contained in the PMP.
R2- As risks are encountered are they being confronted in a timely manner to determine a proper response strategy?	YES	Partially	No		2	⇩	The project is not conducting formal Risk Management activities.
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?	YES	Partially	No		2	⇩	The acquisition phase ended with the main contract signing in June, much later than planned. The Avolve contract is not yet signed. The project expects final signature this week (w/o 8/12/13). This is not expected to impact the project's ability to demonstrate the Proof of Concept completely. Project initiation started June 26. The Project Plan and SOW are part the Phase I deliverables due by mid-July. Phase 1 deliverables include the Engagement Plan, Formal Project Plan, Sandbox setup, Project Team Training and Proof of Concept prototype. The Engagement Plan is final and has been accepted by the City. This should have been completed within a week or two of project initiation. The Formal Project Plan (Deliverable 2, aka "D2") will change as the managers plan out the D2 sub deliverables. The other P1 deliverables have all been laid out in the P1 schedule. The end of P1 is scheduled for 12/31/13. This will be too late to monitor P1 progress. CAI QA met with ITAP and asked that all P1 deliverables be assigned a date.

R4- Is the project experiencing variances from budget baselines? Are significant cost overruns occurring? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?	NO	Some	Yes		3	⇩	The acquisition took much longer than planned. However, the costs for the acquisition phase were within the original plan. The PM added costs to cover the PM position to the Triple Constraint slide for the TOC. The project has not developed the budget baseline for inclusion into the TOC Triple Constraint slide.
R5 – Are stakeholders engaged and aligned on project roles, authority and outcomes?	YES				5	⇔	Yes. ITAP held a first-in-series kickoff meeting 6/25/13. Key stakeholders included the Commissioner, Bureau Director, representatives from all vendors, BTS, project staff, and some partner bureaus. The project conducted other kickoff-style meetings for additional BDS staff and other bureaus. Stakeholders are involved in ongoing planning via Division Managers' meetings, Team meeting, and more detail-oriented process analysis meetings.
R6 – Do business and technology leadership have shared expectations for urgency and priority?	YES				4	⇔	Yes. BDS and BTS have a close partnership for the project planning. BTS and BDS worked closely through the acquisition phase. They are working closely though planning phase. BTS is showing excellent commitment to the schedule, including the sandbox setup. BTS will be a valuable partner in risk management activities. The city interfaces with some counties for property recording. These external agencies are not yet incorporated into the project.
R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider's team or approach?	NO	Some	Yes		3	⇩	The project is not conducting formal Risk Management activities. This is a multi-bureau, multi-jurisdictional, multi-vendor project. Those factors alone increase risks that will likely remain for most of the project. Other vendor-related key factors increasing risk: - One vendor contract is not yet signed. - ITAP developing a detailed schedule for P1 tasks. Some tasks are too long in duration and should be further decomposed. The dates for the Formal Project Plan (D2) will change as the managers schedule the list of sub deliverables. In the meantime, P1 activities continue. - The project is hiring a new PM. This process is behind schedule.
R8- Are the projects human resources appropriately skilled and prepared for the project?	YES	Partially	No		3	⇩	The project requires a professional PM. BDS is recruiting one. The process is behind schedule. The new PM may be in place by the end of August. The necessary specific skills and quantity of those skills will be difficult to validate until a formal schedule for P1 is complete. Skill requirements will be further validated when a full project plan is complete at the end of P1, currently expected 12/21/13. Specific skills that may be of concern include Enterprise Service Bus (ESB), and IVR, and SharePoint.
R9 – Are technology risks being addressed and planned for?	YES	Partially	No		3	⇩	The project is not conducting formal Risk Management activities. BTS and BDS jointly reviewed the contract and participated in negotiations. BTS and BDS are actively investigating some major risks, including a new Enterprise Services Bus (ESB).
R10 – Are factors external to the project negatively influencing the project team's ability to succeed?	NO	Partially	Yes		4	⇩	The new Commissioner supports the project. The Mayor and Bureau Director directed BDS to hire a professional PM. That process is taking longer than expected. This new PM should be involved in the planning activities currently under way.

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - PR	Reporting Date: 8/12/2013
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***	*Six metrics are yellow.* *Three metrics are red. Lack of final plans and a final P1 schedule are the primary risks causing the red assignments.*
Overall Trend	*Deteriorating*	*The changes in rating colors and number assignments are due to two major factors:* *1. Changes in the method to assign numbers and colors.* *2. Increase in urgency for the metrics due to project progress and lack of some planning and monitoring artifacts.* *Prior Report score was 4.6*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**3**
Reporting Summary	*The changes in rating colors and number assignments are due to major factors:* *1. Changes in the method to assign numbers and colors.* *2. Increase in urgency for the metrics due to project progress and lack of some planning and monitoring artifacts.* *The project developed a set of basic plans last year. They are in draft form. They are strong on description of the subject matter. They are light on descriptions of actual activities. Now that Team Sierra is engaged, the project should finalize all those plans (PMP, RMP, CommMP, ChangeMP, and IMP) with collaborative planning with TS.* *The primary goal is to develop a detailed schedule for at least P1. That schedule should include as much P2 through P7 details as is available. Then the project can validate milestone and cost data.*	
Recommendations	*1) Finalize the Project Management Plan, including a description of how the project manages and reports on the* sub-projects *such as GIS, and Data Clean-up.* *2) Develop a detailed schedule for P1, including a less detailed schedule for P2 through P7.* *3) Finalize the Change Management Plan to describe Team Sierra and COP activities.* *4) Finalize the Communication Plan to reflect current needs and activities.* *5) Reinstitute regular status reporting with a one- or two-page status report to give interested parties a view into project progress, risks, and issues.* *6) Establish Issues and Decisions logs (can be the same log) to capture decisions and to give visibility to project issues. SharePoint is an excellent venue for such logs.* *7) Finalize the Issues Management Plan to reflect actual COP, Team Sierra, partner agencies, partner bureaus, and other stakeholder activates.*	

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				5	⇔	The updated Business Case clearly presents the costs, benefits and payback period for the project. The Business Case does not include success or performance metrics.
PR2- Have all business, functional and technical requirements been clearly documented and prioritized by stakeholders?	YES				5	⇔	Yes. The Team Sierra contract obligates them to fulfill requirements established by the City in Attachment D of the RFP.

PR3- Does the project have a realistic timeline based on a work breakdown structure analysis of required activities?	YES	Partially	No		2	⇩	No. The project does not have a final schedule for P1. The current schedule includes dates for the P1 deliverables and much of the tasks to produce them. The schedule requires further decomposition of long tasks, detail tasks for the Formal Project Plan and available detail for P2 through P7. P1 will produce the Formal Project Plan, including the schedule, in December '13. That final schedule will likely have a final go-live of December '15; six months later than the current plans.
PR4 – Does the project have a realistic budget? Are adequate financial resources available to accomplish the projects goals?	YES	Partially	No		2	⇔	Partially. Delays to date have not caused cost increases. Most costs are associated with the vendors and are fixed. The costs for P1 cannot be evaluated until the project has a schedule that includes detail for P1 and available detail for P2 through P7. The project has not yet reported baseline cost data. The formal schedule, due in December '13, will extend final go-live to December '15. The effect on costs is not yet available. The TOC would like to see reporting of actuals to begin now that the project has started.
PR5 – Does the project plan contain all tasks required to successfully deliver the project?	YES	Partially	No		2	⇩	The project is developing a detailed schedule for P1. The schedule requires further refinement: decomposition of long tasks, additional detail for the Formal Project Plan, and available detail for P2 through P7.
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?	YES	Partially	No		2	⇩	The tentative schedule and the budget plan are reasonable for a project this size. Contingency Plans for possible disruptions have not been developed. The P1 schedule in development indicates a longer project. The schedule is longer, due at least in part to the length of the acquisition. The affect on cost is not yet determined.
PR7- Does the project have a formal Change Management Plan? Are changes to scope following these processes?	YES	In Process	No		3	⇩	ITAP has a draft Change Management Plan. Now that Team Sierra is working, it should be updated to describe the Change Management activities.
PR8 – Are communications on the project happening in a timely manner to the right audiences?	YES	Partially	No		3	⇩	ITAP has a draft Communication Plan. The project also created a separate document with a communications matrix. The project should finalize the Comm Plan. The project is not producing regular status reports to give interested parties a quick one- or two-page summary of progress and issues/risks. The project does communicate extensively with stakeholders. The vendor, partner agencies, BTS, BDS all have strong representation at regular meetings.
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		3	⇩	Partially. The PM is managing the toward a milestone list that is regularly presented to the TOC. The project is developing a detailed schedule with resource-leveled, sequenced tasks. Some long-duration tasks should be further decomposed. The PM should have such a detailed schedule at least for P1, including somewhat less detailed schedule for P2 through P7. The PM is managing some workflows with other schedules in MS/Excel.
PR10 – Is the Project Manager taking appropriate action in response to the occurrence issues and risks?	YES	Partially	No		3	⇩	The project is not conducting formal Risk Management activities. The Issues Management Plan is not final. The draft includes excellent explanation of the process. The PM should finalize the plan with descriptions of planned activates. The PM is addressing project risks and issues with partner agencies, the vendors, BTS, and BDS.

Assessment Area	Project Management - PM	Reporting Date: 8/12/2013
Description	*The Project Management assessment area evaluates the project's 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	***Yellow***	*Five metrics are yellow.* *Two metrics are red. Lack of final plans and a P1 schedule are the primary risks causing the red assignment.*
Overall Trend	*Deteriorating*	*The changes in rating colors and number assignments are due to two major factors:* *1. Changes in the method to assign numbers and colors.* *2. Increase in urgency for the metrics due to project progress and lack of some planning and monitoring artifacts.* *Prior Report score was 4.9*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**3.3**
Reporting Summary	*Paul Scarlett and the Mayor's Office directed the project to add a professional project manager. The recruitment is taking longer than planned. The position was posted June 24. Interviews occurred in July. The goal is to have the position filled by late August.* *The project is working without finalized plans and without a detailed schedule. This makes monitoring less reliable.* *A detailed schedule is planned for December, as part of a formal project plan. However, P1 is large enough and long enough to require a detailed schedule.* *When detailed plans are available, the schedule will likely increase and the costs may also increase.*	
Recommendations	*1) Hire a Project Manager.* *2) Finalize draft projects plans, including a detailed P1 schedule with some long-duration tasks decomposed, and more detail for phases P2 through P7.*	

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 Process	No		3	⇩	Paul Scarlett and the Mayor's Office directed BDS to add a professional project manager to manage the City's ITAP resources and the performance of the vendor in order to manage project risks. The recruitment is under way, with a round 2 technical interview the week of 7/30/13. The process is taking longer than planned. A new PM could start late August. In the meantime, the management team as a whole is running the project.
PM2-Are all project roles and responsibilities clearly defined and assigned?	YES	In Process	No		3	⇩	ITAP has a Staff Resource Plan. Assignments will be updated based on the Master Project Plan being developed with Team Sierra during P1. In the meantime, the project should finalize the plans and thereby clearly define roles and responsibilities.

PM3- Is the City effectively leveraging its contractual authority to resolve issues with vendors and subcontractors?	YES	Partially	No		3	⇩	The Avolve contract is not yet signed. The project expects no impact on the POC. No other contract issues reported.
PM4 – Are the Project Manager, Sponsor and Steering Committee heeding project warning signs and effectively managing risk?	YES	Partially	No		3	⇩	The project team is listening closely to QA advice. Corrective action is not yet in place.
PM5 – Is the project experiencing negative impacts due to unresolved issues?	NO	Some	Yes		3	⇩	The Avolve contract is not signed. The project is proceeding without finalized plans. A detailed schedule for P1 is in progress; it requires further decomposition of long-duration tasks and more detail for phase P2 through P7.
PM6 – Are business units and end users involved and participating as stakeholder in the project outcomes?	YES				5	⇔	Yes. ITAP held a first-in-series kickoff meeting 6/25/13. Key stakeholders included the Commissioner, Bureau Director, representatives from all vendors, BTS, project staff, and some partner bureaus. The project conducted other kickoff-style meetings for additional BDS staff and other bureaus. Stakeholders are involved in ongoing planning via Division Managers' meetings, Team meeting, and more detail-oriented process analysis meetings.
PM7 – Is the City properly prepared for the organizational and cultural changes that the project will affect?	YES				5	⇔	Yes. This project will not cause any organizational or cultural changes. (This could have been rated as n/a).
PM8 – Has turnover occurred on key roles such as the PM, Sponsor, Steering Committee or leads? If so, are transitions being managed properly?	NO	Some	Yes		4	⇩	BDS is recruiting a PM to run the project. The vendor split the PM duties for the TS PM. The assigned the PM-specific duties to a Project Director in order to allow the TS PM to focus on the technical lead aspects of the job. This change was accompanied by a Change Order and approved by BDS.
PM9 – Are accepted industry best practices for project management being followed?	YES	Partially	No		2	⇩	The project is developing a P1 schedule. It requires further refinement, including decomposition of long tasks, additional detail for the Formal Project Plan, and available detail for P2 through P7. As the schedule is refined, the team is using it to manage P1. The project is proceeding without finalized management plans. The project has not reported baseline cost data for the TOC.
PM10 – Does the project team have confidence that the project goals are obtainable given the project scope, budget and timeline?	YES	Partially	No		2	⇩	Both the ITAP and Team Sierra are confident in achieving the product scope. However, the timeline is very likely to lengthen. A schedule change will likely affect project costs.

Assessment Area	Product Deliverables - PD	Reporting Date: 8/12/2013
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*	*Early deliverables are arriving. Quality and timing seem appropriate.*
Overall Trend	*This is the initial report. No trend data*	
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**5**
Reporting Summary	*This is the first report with ratings assigned to this Assessment Area.* *The COP received the Engagement Plan quickly enough. However, review and acceptance is taking longer than reasonable for such a document. The draft that CAI reviewed has many comments and tracked changes. However, the document lists 7/15/2013 as an acceptance date.*	
Recommendations	*1) The COP must commit to more timely review and providing corrections, clarifications, and approval for deliverables.*	

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	Partially	No		5		The Acceptance Test criteria are described in suitable detail in the Sierra Contract.
PD2- Is the vendor performing according to contract terms? Are they responsive to issues?	Yes				5		Yes. TS delivered an Engagement Plan within a week of arriving at BDS. Delays in final approval are due to the COP.
PD3 - Are the vendor's methodologies and work processes compatible with the City standards and best practices?	Yes				5		It is early in the project. The vendor seems responsive to the COP needs.
PD4 - Is the vendor showing discipline and diligence to reduce the impacts of change to the project and agreed upon scopes of work?					0		
PD5 - Are the vendors demonstrating best practice quality assurance processes and controls in the development of deliverables?					0		
PD6 - Are deliverables being provided that meet the business need and are fit for use?	Yes				5		The one deliverable, a draft of the Engagement Plan was suitable for its purpose.
PD7 – Are deliverables provided of quality that meets or exceeds City requirements?					0		
PD8 - Is proper training, knowledge transfer and documentation accompanying all vendor deliverables?					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?					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				5		The PM is confident in TS' commitment and ability to deliver. The contract structure indicates that the vendor is confident in their own abilities.