

Project Title	Office 365	Reporting Date: 4/14/2014
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 migrations extend to November '14. Schedule-related metrics assessed red: R3.
Budget Rating	Yellow	The budget may be sufficient for the extended timeline. This will be reassessed when the final schedule is available. Budget-related metrics assessed red: None.
Scope Stability Rating	Green	MS/O'10 and MS/O'07 are options, if necessary. The project may increase scope to account for non-user-associated pst's. (See new recommendation.) Scope-related metrics assessed red: None.
Overall Trend	Increase	Prior Report Overall Score: 3.9
Overall Score	Calculated	4.1
Risk Management	Carried from worksheet	3.9
Project Deliverables	Carried from worksheet	3.8
Project Management	Carried from worksheet	4.1
Product Deliverables	Carried from worksheet	4.7
Reporting Summary	<p>The current timeline extends to November 2014.</p> <p>The MS/Office'13 deployments are progressing. Eight waves have been completed to date. The Help Desk and Desktop Support are getting better at addressing issues and there are fewer issues with each wave.</p> <p>The BTS e-mail migrations started March 24. The project gathered data to determine the migration velocity. This data helped develop the new timeline.</p> <p>The PM is updating the schedule for e-mail and pst's.</p>	
Changes since last report	<p>The overall rating increased from 3.9 to 4.1. All four Assessment Areas increased. The increase is mostly due to a more realistic timeline that includes e-mail and pst's. The new timeline extends to November 2014. Also, the current budget may be sufficient to cover project activities to the end of the e-mail and pst migrations.</p> <p>Desktop Support will assign 2 FTE's to support the pst migration process and administer the migration tool.</p> <p>The project has one scope issue: possible inclusion of network-based, non-user-account-associated pst's. If it is in scope, the project timeline may be further extended.</p>	
Current Recommendations	Determine if the migration of the network-based pst's is within the scope of the project. If so, then plan for that effort in the schedule and budget.	

<p>Status of Prior Recommendations</p>	<p><i>Finalize the schedule and budget. Add migration tasks and estimates for e-mail, including pst's to the schedule.</i> Status: <i>In process. A BTS group establish deployment velocity metrics and human resources needed to run and support the tool during migrations. The E-mail and pst migrations extend through November 2014. The schedule needs more detail for the e-mail migration waves.</i></p> <p><i>Establish metrics for a back out process; how long the users would be down if their PCs must be set back to Office2003.</i> Status: <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i> Status: <i>The project identified the process for maintaining distribution lists. The project is working on the bulk e-mail limitations with TBC's and Liaisons.</i></p>
<p>Individuals Interviewed/Dates</p>	<p><i>Mark Van Patten 3/27/14, 4/10/14, 4/14/14</i> <i>Brian Pirello 4/10/14</i> <i>Carolyn Glass 3/27/14</i></p>
<p>Documents Reviewed/Dates</p>	<p><i>E-mail-PST Migrations (MS/Project file)</i> <i>Office 365 - Implementation -Current (MS/Project file)</i> <i>ESC - Office 365 Presentation 3-27-14 and 4-10-14</i> <i>Office 365_Bureau Update_Mar 2014</i> <i>TOC Meeting Notes 3-17-14</i> <i>TOC Triple Constraint Project Ratings 03.17.14</i></p>
<p>Meetings Attended/Dates</p>	<p><i>TOC Meeting 4/21/14</i> <i>Executive Steering Committee 3/27/14, 4/10/14</i> <i>TOC Report Review w/PM 4/11/14</i></p>

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R	Reporting Date: 4/14/2014
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	Two metrics are yellow. One metric is red.
Overall Trend	Increase	Planning for pst's extends the timeline to November 2014. Prior Report Score: 3.7
Overall Score	Calculated	3.9
Reporting Summary	<p>The rating for this sheet increased from 3.7 to 3.9. The increase is due to the project's progress and its ability to address project risks.</p> <p>The planning for the e-mail and pst migrations extends the project into November 2014. The project collected enough data to plan the .pst migrations. The plan includes new human resource requirements to administer the pst migrations. The schedule extension may not increase the budget.</p>	
Recommendations (Status is on the Executive Summary sheet.)	<p>Finalize the schedule and budget.</p> <p>Add e-mail migration tasks and estimates as a separate workflow to the schedule.</p> <p>Establish a back out process; how long the users would be down if their PCs must be set back to Office2003.</p>	

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. The project has a good Risk Matrix with action items identified. With the BTS pst migrations, the project collected data for the pst migrations. This allows the project to develop a schedule.
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?	NO	Minor	YES		2	↔	The MS/Office'13 deployments extend to August 2014. The e-mail migrations extend the project to November 2014. The project gathered performance metrics to determine the migration velocity. Further refinement of the e-mail migration schedule is needed to confirm this 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	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. Though the schedule is extended to November 2014, the additional effort may fit within the current budget.
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	↔	Business users and technology leadership understand the need for this change. End users are eagerly looking forward to additional e-mail storage.

R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider’s team or approach?	Some	Yes	Many		4	↑	<p>Bureaus were responsible for testing their own <i>non-vertical</i> apps. BTS assisted as requested. This risks ineffective testing and raises the risk of issues at deployment.</p> <p>Testing approach assumes very quick turnaround by support/coding staff to keep project on schedule.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Third-party software vendors have provided compliant versions. Some exceptions remain, though all exceptions are adequately planned for. (See recommendation for a backout process above.)</p>
R8- Are the project's human resources appropriately skilled and prepared for the project?	YES	In Progress	NO		4	↑	<p>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.</p> <p>The project hired interns to augment project staff.</p> <p>The project will use MS' Train-the-Trainer (free) to assist Training Coordinators.</p> <p>BTS will assign 2 new FTE's to administer the pst migration tool.</p>
R9 – Are technology risks being addressed and planned for?	YES	Partially	NO		4	↔	<p>The pilots were useful in determining deployment velocities for MS/Office.</p> <p>The project tested migration tools to determine a deployment velocity for <i>e-mail</i>.</p> <p>The project modified the MS/Office deployment for 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.</p>
R10 – Are factors external to the project negatively influencing the project team’s ability to succeed?	NO	Minor	YES		4	↔	<p>The Windows-7 replacement is complete.</p> <p>Some TRACS users will need MS/Word '07 for TRACS interfaces.</p> <p>Microsoft and Planet Tech. corrected problems encountered with the e-mail migration software.</p> <p>A BTS group assessed a tool to migrate the pst's.</p>

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - PR	Reporting Date: 4/14/2014
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	Six metrics are yellow. No metrics are red.
Overall Trend	Increase	The e-mail/pst migrations extend the project to November 2014. Prior Report Score: 3.6
Overall Score	Calculated	3.8
Reporting Summary	<p>The rating for this sheet increased from 3.6 to 3.8. The rating increased because the project has a more realistic timeline for e-mail/pst migrations.</p> <p>The schedule currently extends into November.</p> <p>The project gathered metrics to plan the pst migrations. Desktop Support will assign 2 FTE's to administer the pst migration tool.</p> <p>The project identified network-based pst's that must be migrated. The PM is to determine if this migration is in the project scope. (See the recommendation below.)</p>	
Recommendations (Status is on the Executive Summary sheet.)	<p>Finalize the project schedule and budget.</p> <p>Add e-mail migration tasks and estimates as a separate workflow to the schedule. (duplicate)</p> <p>Determine if the migration of the network-based pst's is within the scope of the project. If so, then plan for that effort in the schedule and budget.</p>	

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	↓	Some users may need help modifying their processes for Office2013. The Change Mgr., in conjunction with BTS TBC's and bureau TC's, will identify these process changes. The project discovered some 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. These issues are being addressed. The project identified additional pst's that are to be migrated. These pst's are located on the network and are no longer associated with an individual e-mail account. The project should determine if these are in the project scope and whether they must be accounted for in the schedule and budget. (See Recommendation above.)
PR3- Does the project have a realistic timeline based on a work breakdown structure analysis of required activities?	YES	In Progress	NO		3	↑	Plans for the pst migration extended the project. The current timeline ends in November '14. This is a more realistic timeline.

PR4 – Does the project have a realistic budget? Are adequate financial resources available to accomplish the project's goals?	YES	In Progress	NO		3	↔	The current budget accounts for activity up to the end of the plan. The extended timeline may not require additional budget. 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		3	↑	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 schedule should define specific e-mail migration waves.
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?	YES	Partially	NO		4	↑	The schedule is extended to November '14 and accounts for e-mail and pst migrations. Costs fit within the current budget. 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		3	↔	Though the PM does not have a final schedule, he is managing the project according to an agreed/approved approach. The project is developing a new schedule with separate workflows for the e-mail and pst migrations. The project must determine if the network-based pst's are in scope. (See recommendation above.)
PR10 – Is the Project Manager taking appropriate action in response to the occurrence of issues and risks?	YES	Partially	NO		4	↔	The project schedule requires new workflows for the email/pst migrations.

Assessment Area	Project Management - PM	Reporting Date: 4/14/2014
Description	<i>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.</i>	
Overall Rating	Green	Four metrics are yellow. No metrics are red.
Overall Trend	Increase	Prior Report Score: 3.9
Overall Score	Calculated	4.1
Reporting Summary	<i>The rating for this sheet increased from 3.9 to 4.1. The increase is due to planning progress for e-mail and pst migrations. Supporting the bureaus through all the testing, training, and deployment will be a challenge for BTS.</i>	
Recommendations (Status is on the Executive Summary sheet.)	<i>Add e-mail migration tasks and estimates as a separate workflow to the schedule. (duplicate)</i>	

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 experienced. 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 had difficulty with Planet Tech. The City was firm regarding payment to the vendor for migration work. MS and PT corrected problems with the e-mail migration wizard.
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		3	↑	The PM is rebuilding the schedule. The project gathered metrics to plan the pst migrations. 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		No turnover in recent months.
PM9 – Are accepted industry best practices for project management being followed?	YES	Partially	NO		3		The PM is proceeding according to an agreed-upon approach. The PM is building a schedule to include e-mail and pst migrations. 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: 4/14/2014
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	Green	One metric is yellow. No metrics are red.
Overall Trend	Increase	Prior Report Score: 4.5
Overall Score	Calculated	4.7
Reporting Summary	The rating for this sheet increased from 4.5 to 4.7. This increase is because the project is not having the problems with the current vendors as it had with Planet Tech. Pilots A, B, and C are migrated. Office 365 imposes limitations on some business uses: bulk e-mail and distribution list handling. (See recommendation below.)	
Recommendations (Status is on the Executive Summary sheet.)	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 <i>non-vertical apps.</i> is up to the bureaus, with some support, but out of BTS control.
PD2- Is the vendor performing according to contract terms? Are they responsive to issues?	YES	In Progress	NO		5	↑	MS and the pst tool vendor are providing suitable support for their software.
PD3 - Are the vendor's methodologies and work processes compatible with the City standards and best practices?	YES	In Progress	NO		5	↑	MS and the pst tool vendor are providing suitable support for their software.
PD4 - Is the vendor showing discipline and diligence to reduce the impacts of change to the project and agreed upon scopes of work?	YES	In Progress	NO		5	↔	The vendors have been supportive. Though there have been no scope changes for MS/Office, Office 365, or the pst migrations.
PD5 - Are the vendors demonstrating best practice quality assurance processes and controls in the development of deliverables?	YES	In Progress	NO		5	↔	Vendors provide suitable quality and support for their products.
PD6 - Are deliverables being provided that meet the business need and are fit for use?	YES	In Progress	NO		5	↔	MS/Office, Office 365, and the pst tool are fit for use.
PD7 – Are deliverables provided of quality that meets or exceeds City requirements?	YES	In Progress	NO		5	↔	MS/Office, Office 365, and the pst tool meet City requirements.
PD8 - Is proper training, knowledge transfer and documentation accompanying all vendor deliverables?	YES	In Progress	NO		4	↔	MS provides suitable documentation and support for their products. 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. The pst tool vendor provides good documentation and support for their product.
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. The new timeline is more realistic.