Project Title	Office 365	Reporting Date: 2/18/2014
Quality Assurance Executive Summary		
Authored by:	*Clifford Smith, PMP* *Case Associates, Inc.*	
Overall Rating	***Yellow***	
Schedule Rating	***Yellow***	*Deployment waves extend to August '14.* *Pst's may get their own migration workflow. E-mail and pst migration delays will likely extend the project.* *Schedule-related metrics assessed red: R3, PR3, PM5.*
Budget Rating	***Yellow***	*The project can expect budget changes if the schedule changes. This will be reassessed when the final schedule is available.* *Budget-related metrics assessed red: None.*
Scope Stability Rating	***Green***	*Some vendors may not certify their software as MS/O'13-compliant in time. MS/O'10 and MS/O'07 are options, if necessary. The project has shifted some deployments to account for vendor delivery dates for MS/O'13-compliant versions.* *Approximately 500 (prior report stated 300) TRACS users will receive MS/Word'07 in addition to the MS/Office 2013 suite.* *Scope-related metrics assessed red: None.*
Overall Trend	*Decrease*	*Prior Report Overall Score: 3.8*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**3.6**
Risk Management	*Carried from worksheet*	3.5
Project Deliverables	*Carried from worksheet*	3.4
Project Management	*Carried from worksheet*	3.9
Product Deliverables	*Carried from worksheet*	3.4
Reporting Summary	*The current timeline extends to August '14. E-mail migrations are on hold. The project has a .pst migration tool and must establish a deployment velocity. Then it can plan the e-mail migrations. This delay will likely extend the project and is the reason for the rating decrease.* *The PM is developing an updated schedule. The schedule should include a separate workflow for e-mail and possibly a separate workflow for pst's. That schedule should also be updated and maintained to reflect project progress.* *The project progressed through the pilot stage. Pilots A and B are migrated to Office 365. Pilot C e-mail migrations are delayed.* *BTS testing shows that the project can deploy MS/O'13 to TRACS users. In addition, the project will deploy MS/Word'07 to approximately 500 TRACS users. This negates the need for another project to upgrade TRACS users when TRACS is retired.*	
Changes since last report	*The overall rating decreased from 3.8 to 3.6. All Assessment Areas decreased somewhat. The decrease is due to the e-mail migration delays, the possible need for a separate workflow for pst migrations and the need for plans and a schedule for that workflow.* *Also, Office 365 imposes some new limitations on the end users such as bulk e-mail limits. The limitations were recently discovered. The project will need to plan how to identify the affected bureaus and help modify their processes to account for the new limits.*	
Current Recommendations	*Determine the impact of newly-discovered Office 365 limitations. This will include identifying the affected bureaus and helping them modify their processes to accommodate the limits.* *Note: A recommendation to plan for an additional workflow for pst's was included in a "Prior Recommendation."*	

Status of Prior Recommendations (Note: Gaps in the numbers indicate completion as of the prior report.)	*Finalize the schedule and budget.* *Status: In process. The project team finalized the MS/Office'13 deployment waves with the bureaus in December '13. The e-mail migration schedule is not scheduled. Depending on the project's strategy, the schedule may also need a separate workflow for pst's.* *Maintain the MS/Project schedule to reflect project progress.* *Status: The PM is not using the MS/Project schedule to reflect project progress.* *The project should establish metrics for a back out process; how long the users would be down if their PCs must be set back to Office2003.* *Status: The project is accepting this risk. If necessary, Desktop Support will develop scripts to reinstall the previous version of MS/Office version. The elapsed time to carry this out is not known.* *Add migration tasks and estimates for e-mail, including pst's to the schedule.* *Status: The e-mail and pst migrations are not yet planned and not reflected in the schedule. The PM will have a "pst pilot" to gather metrics for a pst deployment velocity.*
Individuals Interviewed/Dates	*Mark Van Patten 2/13/14*
Documents Reviewed/Dates	*Deployment Wave detail (hardcopy of MS/Excel sheet)* *Office 365_bureau update_Jan 2014 (Project report to TOC)* *ESC - Office 365 Presentation 1-16-14* *ESC - Office 365 Presentation 2-13-14*
Meetings Attended/Dates	*TOC Meeting 2/24/14* *Executive Steering Committee 1/16/14, 2/13/14* *TOC Report Review w/PM 2/13/14*

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R	Reporting Date: 2/18/2014
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*	*Six metrics are yellow.* *One metric is red.*
Overall Trend	*Decrease*	*As the project identifies and manages risks, and replans the project, the TOC can expect variances in the schedule and budget.* *Prior Report Score: 3.7*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**3.5**
Reporting Summary	*The separate workflow for the e-mail migrations will likely delay project completion. The project is considering an additional workflow for the pst's. The project has not collected enough reliable data to plan the .pst migrations. This may delay the project and add resource requirements. The effect on the schedule will not be known until the project has reliable metrics for the pst's. Then it can plan and communicate the e-mail migrations. These delays may extend the schedule and possibly increase the budget.*	
Recommendations (Status is on the Executive Summary sheet.)	*Finalize the schedule and budget.* *Add e-mail migration tasks and estimates as a separate workflow to the schedule.*	

Metric	Green 5 points	Yellow 3 points	Red 1 point	NA 0 points	Score	Trend	Reporting Summary
R1 - Does a Risk Management Plan exist for the project?	YES	In Progress	NO		5	⇔	The RMP describes the RM process.
R2- As risks are encountered are they being confronted in a timely manner to determine a proper response strategy?	YES	In Progress	NO		3	⇩	Some project risks were identified early in the project and are being discussed as part of usual project management activities. More risks are being identified. The project has a good Risk Matrix with action items identified. The project is experiencing delays in collecting data for the pst migrations. This is delaying schedule development.
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?	NO	Minor	YES		2	⇔	The schedule for the MS/Office'13 deployments extends to August 2014. The e-mail migrations are not scheduled. The project is gathering performance metrics to determine the migration velocity. When they know the rate at which they can migrate the e-mail, the PM will be able to create a schedule.
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		4	⇔	The revised budget was increased by $455k (37%). It has since been lowered slightly. The PM receives SAP reports to monitor the budget. The budget will likely increase as the project timeline increases.
R5 – Are stakeholders engaged and aligned on project roles, authority and outcomes?	YES	Partially	NO		5	⇔	PPB is out of scope for this project. Each Bureaus has a liaison to coordinate with BTS. Each bureau nominated Training Coordinators to lead to training, testing, and deployment activities. The bureaus and Desktop Support collectively planned out the waves to account for deployment velocity, support needs, and business cycles to avoid.

R6 – Do business and technology leadership have shared expectations for urgency and priority?	YES	Partially	NO		4	⇔	The bureaus that receive credit card payments share an urgency to be PCI-compliant. For other bureaus, the urgency from Microsoft is not likely to be shared by business users. Though business users understand the need for this change, they will see it as a risk without much benefit. End users are eagerly looking forward to additional e-mail storage.
R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider's team or approach?	NO	Minor	YES		3	⇔	Bureaus were responsible for testing their own *non-vertical* apps. BTS assisted as requested. This risks ineffective testing and raises the risk of issues at deployment. Testing approach assumes very quick turnaround by support/coding staff to keep project on schedule. Some Office uses may not be easy for a user to rework their approach to their daily tasks. To identify these, the project established Training Coordinators in each bureau. The number of deployment waves has increased as the project accounts for PCI needs, business cycles, deployment velocity, and support capacity. The project plans 15 deployment waves. Some 3rd party software vendors may not certify their software for MS/Office 2013 in time for the project schedule.
R8- Are the project's human resources appropriately skilled and prepared for the project?	YES	In Progress	NO		3	⇔	As the project is currently defined, it may have suitable skills for the work. However it may need more resources at BTS to support the Liaisons and the Training coordinators through deployment. The resources needed to support the e-mail migrations are not yet known. The project hired interns to augment project staff. The project will use MS' Train-the-Trainer (free) to assist Training Coordinators.
R9 – Are technology risks being addressed and planned for?	YES	Partially	NO		3	⇔	The pilots were useful in determining deployment velocities for MS/Office. The project is testing migration tools to determine a deployment velocity for *e-mail.* More risks are now added to an enhanced Risk Matrix. Strategies and status should be described for each risk. Some 3rd party software vendors may not certify their software for MS/Office 2013 in time for the project schedule. The project has *juggled* the schedule and modified the MS/Office deployment fro some TRACS users. For vendor apps that will not be certified in time, the project is communicating to users that their migration could be delayed or that they may be migrated with MS/O'2007.
R10 – Are factors external to the project negatively influencing the project team's ability to succeed?	NO	Minor	YES		3	⇔	The PM has been with the City for a few months. The Change Manager is new to the City. The Windows-7 replacement is complete. Some TRACS users will not be able to use MS/Office'13. Microsoft and Planet Tech. corrected problems encountered with the e-mail migration software. The project purchased a tool to migrate the .pst's.

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - PR	Reporting Date: 2/18/2014
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	*Yellow*	*Five metrics are yellow.* *Two metrics are red.*
Overall Trend	*Decrease*	*The e-mail migrations are delayed and will follow their own workflow. The project is considering creating a new workflow for the pst's. Tasks for this should be estimated and defined in the schedule.* *Prior Report Score: 3.7*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**3.4**
Reporting Summary	*The project changed the approach to deploy Office first and then migrate to the cloud. This addresses the PCI compliance issue for credit card dependent bureaus.* *The schedule currently extends into August and includes 15 deployment waves.* *The e-mail migrations are delayed. The project has not developed reliable metrics to plan the pst migrations. The e-mail and pst migrations, whether combined or separate workflows, will likely extend the project timeline.* *The PM will not be able to rebuild a reliable schedule until those metrics are available.* *The project is discovering some new limits imposed by Office 365. (see PR3)*	
Recommendations (Status is on the Executive Summary sheet.)	*Finalize the project schedule and budget.* *Add e-mail migration tasks and estimates as a separate workflow to the schedule. (duplicate)* *Maintain the MS/Project schedule to reflect project progress.*	

Metric	Green 5 points	Yellow 3 points	Red 1 point	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 cites several compelling reasons for the Office365 upgrade. The implied objectives are to avoid potential loss of vendor support, add email storage, and DR capabilities. PCI compliance is not addressed in the Business Case.
PR2- Have all business, functional and technical requirements been clearly documented and prioritized by stakeholders?	YES	In Progress	NO		3	⇩	In one sense there are no new functional requirements to satisfy. However, there are functions that are significantly different in Office2013. Some users may need help figuring out how to modify their processes for Office2013. The Change Mgr., in conjunction with BTS TBC's and bureau TC's, will identify these process changes. The project is discovering some new limits imposed by Office 365. For instance, there are new limits on the quantity of bulk email. There are also limits on how distribution lists must be handled.

PR3- Does the project have a realistic timeline based on a work breakdown structure analysis of required activities?	YES	In Progress	NO		2	⇔	Several factors may change the project schedule. Practical deployment velocity (limited by HD staff availability and physical location of business users) may slow the project. An increase in the number of deployment waves extended the project. Delays in collecting vendor certification for MS/Office'13 interaction with their software may limit the project's ability to deploy MS/Office'13. (Note: As an alternative, the project will deploy 2010 or 2007.) The project does not have migration plans for Office 365. They need to establish acceptable migration velocities, including pst's. Then the PM can include the workflow for the migrations into the schedule and budget. The current timeline ends in August '14. This will likely be extended due to the delays in e-mail migrations.
PR4 – Does the project have a realistic budget? Are adequate financial resources available to accomplish the project's goals?	YES	In Progress	NO		3	⇔	In August, the project added $450k to the budget, largely BTS internal labor. The budget has decreased slightly since then. The current budget accounts for activity up to the end of the plan. The schedule will likely extend and this may cause budget changes. When the schedule is complete, the budget can be validated.
PR5 – Does the project plan contain all tasks required to successfully deliver the project?	YES	Partially	NO		2	⇔	The project determined Day-1 floor support resources. The project may not be taking enough active control of the testing process where they do not have vertical applications staff. The plans are not available in a MS/Project schedule. The schedule should include tasks for the e-mail migrations.
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?	YES	Partially	NO		3	⇔	The schedule will likely increase when the PM develops plans for the e-mail migrations. Costs will also increase as the project timeline increases. These increase are not likely to cause any disruption to business users. Since most of the costs are internal labor, timeline and budget increase are not likely to cause project disruption.
PR7- Does the project have a formal Change Management Plan? Are changes to scope following these processes?	YES	Partially	NO		5	⇔	The new PM will follow reasonable steps to control project scope.
PR8 – Are communications on the project happening in a timely manner to the right audiences?	YES	Partially	NO		5	⇔	Communication with Steering and project sub-teams is occurring at regular meetings. The Change Mgr. and BTS TBC's communicate with Bureau liaisons and TC's.
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		2	⇩	Though the PM does not have a final schedule, he is managing the project according to an agreed/approved approach. Project progress is not reflected in the MS/Project schedule. The project requires a new schedule to include separate workflows for the e-mail and pst migrations.
PR10 – Is the Project Manager taking appropriate action in response to the occurrence of issues and risks?	YES	Partially	NO		4	⇩	The PM improved risk identification and response processes. The project requires schedule requires new workflows for the email/pst migrations.

Assessment Area	Project Management - PM	Reporting Date: 2/18/2014
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	*Green*	*Three metrics are yellow.* *One metric is red.*
Overall Trend	*Slight Decrease*	*Prior Report Score: 4.2*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**3.9**
Reporting Summary	*The project schedule will likely be extended by the separate workflows for e-mail migrations and possibly separate pst migrations. Final plans are pending establishment of an e-mail and pst migration velocity.* *Supporting the bureaus through all the testing, training, and deployment will be a challenge for BTS.* *Rating decreases are due to the e-mail and pst migration delays and the need for a schedule that includes the e-mail and pst migrations.*	
Recommendations (Status is on the Executive Summary sheet.)	*Add e-mail migration tasks and estimates as a separate workflow to the schedule. (duplicate)*	

Metric	Green 5 points	Yellow 3 points	Red 1 point	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	⇔	The PM is skilled, experienced, and acclimated to the City. The Executive Sponsor is very experienced and engaged with the project.
PM2-Are all project roles and responsibilities clearly defined and assigned?	YES	In Progress	NO		5	⇔	The project has a Roles and Responsibilities document from May '13. The Project has a Comm Plan from Sept. '13. The project discusses roles and responsibilities during meetings, such as the Steering Committee.
PM3- Is the City effectively leveraging its contractual authority to resolve issues with vendors and subcontractors?	YES	Partially	NO		5	⇔	The City is having difficulty with Planet Tech. PT has since involved a more senior technician that is more available to the City. The City is being firm regarding payment to the vendor for migration work. MS and PT corrected problems with the e-mail migration wizard. MS is pushing PT to improve its service. Pilots A and B are migrated.
PM4 – Are the Project Manager, Sponsor and Steering Committee heeding project warning signs and effectively managing risk?	YES	Partially	NO		4	⇔	The PM, Sponsor and Steering are all heeding advice from QA. Though not all recommendations are addressed.
PM5 – Is the project experiencing negative impacts due to unresolved issues?	NO	Minor	YES		2	⇩	The PM is rebuilding the schedule. The approach changed due in large part to the urgency of getting Office 2013 deployed to the credit card-dependent bureaus. The project resolved issues with Public Folders and pst's. E-mail migrations for Pilot C and the following waves migrations are on hold. The PM expects to perform the migrations later. The delays will likely extend the project timeline. Some deployments could be delayed or modified to use MS/Office'07 if some software vendors do not certify their software in time.
PM6 – Are business units and end users involved and participating as stakeholders in the project outcomes?	YES	Partially	NO		4	⇔	Some bureaus attend team and steering meetings. BTS assigned TBCs to each bureau. All bureaus nominated Training Coordinators to lead testing, training, and deployment support activities. All bureaus participated in the deployment wave planning.

PM7 – Is the City properly prepared for the organizational and cultural changes that the project will affect?	YES	Partially	NO		4	⇩	The project will not cause significant cultural or organizational changes. The project uncovered some limitations imposed by Office 365, most significantly a limit on outgoing bulk e-mail and handling of distribution lists.
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	⇔	The PM is acclimated to the City. The Change Manager left and was replaced by another project team member.
PM9 – Are accepted industry best practices for project management being followed?	YES	Partially	NO		2	⇩	The PM is proceeding according to an agreed-upon approach. But the project should have a more robust schedule to reflect plans for a separate e-mail migration workflow and possibly a separate pst migration workflow. Once complete, the PM should maintain the schedule to reflect project progress.
PM10 – Does the project team have confidence that the project goals are obtainable given the project scope, budget and timeline?	YES	Partially	NO		3	⇔	Mixed. One BTS participant expressed doubts about BTS' capacity to support all the bureaus through all the testing and deployment activities. Project leadership has a higher confidence in the timeline being developed. Team and oversight confidence can be better assessed when a more complete schedule is available.

Assessment Area	Product Deliverables - PD	Reporting Date: 2/18/2014
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	*Yellow*	*Eight metrics are yellow.* *No metrics are red.*
Overall Trend	*Decrease*	*Prior Report Score: 3.5*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**3.4**
Reporting Summary	*Planet Technologies is almost finished with the Active Directory Migration.* *MS and PT fixed a problem they were having with the e-mail migration wizard. Pilots A and B are migrated. Pilot C and following migrations are on hold until a deployment velocity can be established.* *Office 365 imposes limitations on some business uses: bulk e-mail and distribution list handling. The project will need to identify affected bureaus and help design changes to the business processes.*	
Recommendations (Status is on the Executive Summary sheet.)	*The project should establish metrics for a back out process; how long the users would be down if their PCs must be set back to Office2003.* *Determine the impact of newly-discovered Office 365 limitations. This will include identifying the affected bureaus and helping them modify their processes to accommodate the limits.*	

Metric	Green 5 points	Yellow 3 points	Red 1 point	NA 0 points	Score	Trend	Reporting Summary
PD1 - Does the project have clear criteria for testing and acceptance?	YES	In Progress	NO		4	⇔	Testing *non-vertical apps.* is up to the bureaus, with some support, but out of BTS control. Since the testing is out of BTS control, the project should develop expectations for a back out process whereby users PCs are set back to Office 2003. BTS, working with Planet Tech., has clear definitions for acceptance.
PD2- Is the vendor performing according to contract terms? Are they responsive to issues?	YES	In Progress	NO		3	⇔	Dates have slipped due to the vendor's inability to get the migration tool working. The City escalated the issues to Microsoft. MS and PT resolved the issue. The optimal migration velocity for the pst migration tool is not yet established. The project is starting another small pilot to gather more data.
PD3 - Are the vendor's methodologies and work processes compatible with the City standards and best practices?	YES	Partially	NO		3	⇔	Planet Tech. involved a more senior tech that is more available to the City. Getting MS and PT to work together has been time consuming.
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		3	⇔	Some changes and delays have been due to the vendors lack of up-front discovery. They could have done a better job understanding the issues ahead. The vendor, PT with the urging of MS, is cooperating with the project as dates have changed. Initial investigations with MS did not uncover limitations imposed by Office 365. Bulk e-mail and distribution list limitations will need to be accounted for with some bureaus.
PD5 - Are the vendors demonstrating best practice quality assurance processes and controls in the development of deliverables?	YES	Partially	NO		3	⇔	Planet Tech. adjusted their work dates to account for the changing project timelines. PT and MS are working on issues with the e-mail migrations. Their communication methods seem to take an inordinate time.
PD6 - Are deliverables being provided that meet the business need and are fit for use?	YES	Partially	NO		3	⇔	MS' Migration Wizard was not working and could not be used until November. Planet Tech opened a Support ticket with MS. The issue is now resolved.
PD7 – Are deliverables provided of quality that meets or exceeds City requirements?	YES	Partially	NO		3	⇔	MS' Migration Wizard was not working and could not be used until November. Planet Tech opened a Support ticket with MS. The issue is now resolved.
PD8 - Is proper training, knowledge transfer and documentation accompanying all vendor deliverables?	YES	Partially	NO		3	⇩	PT is working with City staff and delivering "chair to chair" mentoring. MS did not inform the City that Office 365 would come with limitations on bulk e-mail or distribution list handling. The project will need to identify the affected bureaus and help plan business process changes.
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?	No	Some	Yes		5	⇔	None.
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		4	⇔	The PM is confident that the scope can be delivered. He hopes to keep the project within schedule when the e-mail migrations are planned.