Project Resourcing & Schedule

Management System

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

June 1, 2009 – August 31, 2009

California Department of Transportation

Division of Project Management

Office of Statewide Project Management Improvement

Table of Contents

Independent Project Oversight Reports 1
IPO Report for August, 2009 1
Project Oversight Review Checklist for August, 2009 7
IPO Report for July, 2009 12
Project Oversight Review Checklist for July, 2009 18
IPO Report for June, 2009 23
Project Oversight Review Checklist for June, 2009 29

Independent Project Oversight Reports

IPO Report for August 2009

Project Name: Caltrans PRSM **Assessment Date:** August 31, 2009

Frequency: Monthly

Oversight Provider Information

Oversight Leader:	Greg Thomas	**Organization:**	Deloitte & Touche LLP
Phone Number:	916 288 3232	**Email:**	grethomas@deloitte.com

Project Information

Project Number:	**2660-160**	**Department:**	Transportation (Caltrans)
Criticality:	High	**Agency:**	Business, Transportation & Housing
Last Approved Document/Date:	SPR (09/29/08)	**Total One-time Cost:**	$26,119,068
Start Date:	June 7, 2000	**End Date:**	January 6, 2011
Project Manager:	David Youmans	**Organization:**	Caltrans
Phone Number:	916.826.4425	**Email:**	david_youmans@dot.ca.gov

Summary: Current Status

Project Phase:	Adaptation		
Planned Start Date:	October 7, 2008	**Planned End Date:**	August 21, 2009
Actual Start Date:	July 1, 2009	**Forecasted End Date:**	March 18, 2010

Schedule

Select the statement that most closely applies, measured against the last **Finance approved** document.

On Schedule

Ahead-of-schedule:
One or more major tasks or milestones have been completed and approved early (> 5%). All other major tasks and milestones completed and approved according to plan.

On-schedule:
All major tasks and milestones have been completed and approved according to plan. (Within 5%)

Behind Schedule:
One or more major tasks or milestones are expected to be delayed. (> 5%)

Comments: A new baseline schedule was set with the approved SPR dated September 29, 2008. The SPR states the start date of the Planning Phase as September 2, 2008, however, the final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009

The current SPR appears to be inconsistent with the new actual dates. Based on conversations with the Caltrans PRSM IT Project Manager, an updated SPR with a new baseline has been drafted and discussed with the OCIO. The draft SPR has been submitted to the Caltrans PMO office for review. The updated SPR will more accurately reflect the actual start date of the contract.

Based on the draft SPR, the Adaptation Phase was forecasted to end in February 2010. In the August 27, 2009 PRSM Advisory Committee meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Adaptation Phase completion date as March 18, 2010. This represents a difference of one month. Additionally, based on the draft SPR, the PRSM project was forecasted to end on June 13, 2011. In the August 27, 2009, the Implementation Vendor identified the PRSM Project completion date as July 5, 2011. This represents an extension of the project by approximately two weeks. Given this minor change in the end date, IPOC has reported the project as "On Schedule". We will continue to closely monitor the schedule status during the Adaptation Phase.

Resources (Level of Effort) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Within Resources

Fewer Resources
Completion of one or more major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) fewer hours/staff than planned.

Within Resources
All major tasks have been completed and acceptable products created using the planned number of hours/staff (within 5%).

More Resources
Completion of major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) more hours/staff than planned.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR.

Resources (Budget/Cost) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Within Cost

Less cost
The project is (>5%) under budget.

Within cost
The project is operating within budget.

Higher cost
Material budget increases (>5%) are likely.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR.

Quality (Client Functionality) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined

Adequately Defined
Required client functionality is adequately defined, and is being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Inadequately Defined
One or more significant components of required client functionality are inadequately defined, or are not being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Comments: Functionality is adequately defined for the Adaptation Phase which began on July 1, 2009. The Implementation Vendor is currently reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report, which is due to be completed in September 2009.

Quality (Architecture/System Performance) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined

Adequately Defined
The system technical architecture is adequately defined, and modeling, benchmarking and testing are being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Inadequately Defined
The system technical architecture is not adequately defined, or modeling, benchmarking and testing are not being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Comments: System technical architecture and performance are adequately defined for the Adaptation Phase. The Implementation Vendor has submitted a Configuration Management Plan, High Level Design, and updated Architecture Diagram. Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor are working with DTS to configure the development, testing and training environments. As the project progresses, additional refinement may be necessary.

New Risks

No new risks this month.

Progress Toward Addressing Prior Risks

Risk Title: PRSM Project Team Communications

Risk Statement: Effective, clear and frequent communications between the Caltrans PRSM team, the Implementation Vendor, other vendors (e.g., testing and data conversion), and District stakeholder is critical given the size and complexity of PRSM during the Adaptation Phase. The new Communications Plan, while documented, needs to be fully implemented early in the Adaptation Phase. Without effective communications, the PRSM project schedule, scope and quality could be difficult to manage and control.
Probability: Medium Impact: High Time Frame: Long Term Severity: High Assigned to: David Youmans

Recommendation:

- In addition to the weekly PRSM Project Status meetings, IPOC recommends that Caltrans PRSM Project Management and Implementation Vendor Project Management conduct brief "checkpoint" meetings in order to discuss the status of high priority issues and action items. These checkpoint meetings should be no longer than ½ hour in duration and conducted twice per week (i.e., Monday AM and Thursday PM).

Status Update:

Aug 09 Status: The Communications Plan was formally approved in the month of August and provides details surrounding the methods of communication for the PRSM project. PRSM Project Status meetings continue to occur on a weekly basis. PRSM sub-teams (Training sub-team, Configuration Management sub-team) meet at a minimum of once a week to discuss current and upcoming tasks. In addition to the PRSM Project Team meetings, Caltrans prepares and distributes a monthly newsletter and "Nuggets of Knowledge" memo to the districts. Implementation Team training sessions have been scheduled during the month of September that will provide the PRSM Implementation Team with an overview of PRSM Methodology and Functionality.

Risk Title: Timing of Interfaces

Risk Statement: With a new Caltrans financial systems project underway (ERP Financial Infrastructure – "EFIS"), an additional interface will need to be developed. The PRSM project is currently planning to develop an interface to the Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system, which is the Caltrans enterprise financial system that is currently used for operations. The timing for development of the EFIS interface is tentatively planned for September 2009, although the specifications and data requirements are not fully documented at this time. The uncertainties associated with the EFIS interface may have an impact on development and testing resources (potentially increasing development and testing costs) and a potential adverse impact on the project schedule (delay in development of the PRSM solution).

Probability: High Impact: Medium Time Frame: Short Term Severity: High Assigned to: Jacqueline Moore

Recommendations:

- Continue to work closely with the EFIS project by attending the bi-weekly interface planning meetings. Escalate issues related to EFIS timing and resource needs to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution as soon as the interface requirements are finalized.

Status Update:

Aug 09 Status: In addition to the July 09 status, the PRSM Project Team is currently is the process of finalizing PRSM Interface requirements.

July 09 Status: The PRSM Project Team is currently attending bi-weekly meetings with the EFIS Project Team to discuss the interface requirements and plan for development of the interface. The PRSM Project Team has been meeting with representatives of EFIS, Staff Central (time reporting), Earned Value Reporting System (EVRS), and FIDO to gain a better understanding of what and how often data will be exchanged between those systems and PRSM

Risk Title: Resource Availability

Risk Statement: Without adequate Caltrans resources working on PRSM, the project implementation schedule could be delayed. While in the Adaptation Phase, PRSM Project Team members should be allocated full time. Individual Resources may need to be identified at the task level in the Project Plan in order to estimate resource requirements and availability.

Probability: Medium Impact: High Time Frame: Short Severity: High Assigned to: TBD

Recommendations:

- After the PRSM work plan is complete, determine the resource gaps and reallocate effort as appropriate.
- Assign individual resources at the task level in the project schedule to assist in estimating resource requirements. All PRSM project resources, including vendor resources, should be included.

Status Update:

Aug 09 Status: In addition to the July 09 status, two new technical CA Clarity technical resources have joined the PRSM Project Team.

July 09 Status: During this reporting period a new Communications Lead was hired by Caltrans. In addition, a new Software Vendor Consultant joined the team and began working on the "to be" business process versus CA Clarity gap analysis. Caltrans is currently working with the Implementation Vendor to create a detailed "Rolling Wave" schedule (see information on this approach in the General Comments section below) for the Adaptation Part A phase. This schedule will include resource assignments at the task level.

Risk Title: Business Rules and Business Process Changes

Risk Statement: The impact of business changes resulting from the PRSM implementation needs to be sufficiently understood, planned for, and communicated to Caltrans staff. If District field staff are not in agreement with the decisions and consequences of changing/standardizing business rules and business processes, it may have an adverse effect on system acceptance and may disrupt work in progress. This could result in increased resistance to acceptance and usage of the system.

Probability: High Impact: High Time Frame: Med Severity: High Assigned to: David Cordone

Recommendations:

- Implement a formal change management process which will be used for PRSM project related changes. Change management tasks associated with these changes should be incorporated into the project schedule and budget. Changes should be communicated to the key stakeholders.
- Define the process for gaining field consensus on the new business rules and business processes.
- Develop a plan that describes how information on new business rules and business processes will be communicated to the field with sufficient time to get feedback and buy-in.

Status Update:

Aug 09 Status: No new status

July 09 Status: During this reporting period, the Draft 'To Be' business process documentation was sent to the Implementation Managers for review and feedback. The PRSM Project Team scheduled meetings with the Implementation Managers to walkthrough the 'To Be' process documentation the weeks of 7/20 and 7/27. In addition, the list of requirements customizations was drafted. The PRSM Project Team held Joint Application Development (JAD) sessions to go over the customizations list. Caltrans is currently in the process of finalizing the customizations.

General Comments

Deloitte & Touche LLP's IPOC contract with the Caltrans PRSM project started in December 2008. This Independent Project Oversight Report (IPOR) provided by Deloitte & Touche LLP has been developed in accordance with the applicable standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) as per Deloitte & Touche LLP policy.

IPOC has attended various PRSM project meetings throughout the month of August, including the PRSM Implementation Managers meeting, the PRSM Steering Committee meeting, and the PRSM Status meetings.

The PRSM project is in the Adaptation Part A Phase of the project. Seven deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Adaptation Part A Phase: Application Installation Report, Data Initialization Plan, Configuration Plan (High Level WP1 Use Cases), Configuration Plan (Detailed WP1 Design), Training Role Descriptions and Course List, Training and Documentation Plan and Configuration Plan (Interface Architecture). IPOC is planning to review each of these deliverables as they are submitted and will provide comments and feedback.

Beginning in the May 2009 reporting period, PRSM project status meetings have been occurring on a weekly basis versus bi-weekly. During the status meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in Microsoft Project for the Adaptation Part A Phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the Adaptation Part A Phase. In addition, the status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register.

The Implementation Vendor has submitted an Adaptation Phase schedule to Caltrans, which separates the Adaptation Phase into two work packages. Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor may need to have additional discussions regarding the schedule for the Adaptation Phase and the items that belong in each work package. In addition, the Implementation Plan was submitted, which was reviewed by Caltrans, and includes a schedule for the entire project. The Implementation Vendor has proposed a "Rolling Wave" scheduling process for the PRSM project where a more detailed schedule is prepared before the start of each project phase. Prior to the end of each phase or PRSM Payment Point, the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans will work together to develop the specific activities for the tasks in the next Rolling Wave. The new detailed Rolling Wave Plan for the succeeding project phase will be documented in MS Project and will be submitted for State Acceptance as a prerequisite for State Acceptance of the current Payment Point. The detailed Rolling Wave schedules will include lower level tasks, estimated hours to complete, and resource assignments. The Adaptation Phase has been broken into two parts: Part A and Part B. Currently Caltrans is working with the Implementation Vendor to load resources into the detailed project plan for Adaptation Phase Part A, which references the PRSM WBS.

Based on the draft SPR, the Adaptation Phase was forecasted to end in February 2010. In the August 27, 2009 PRSM Advisory Committee meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Adaptation Phase completion date as March 18, 2010. This represents a difference of one month. Additionally, based on the draft SPR, the PRSM project was forecasted to end on June 13, 2011. In the August 27, 2009 PRSM Advisory Committee meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the PRSM Project completion date as July 5, 2011. This represents an extension of the project by approximately two weeks. Given this minor change in the end date, IPOC has reported the project as "On Schedule", however, we will continue to closely monitor the Adaptation Phase status. For more information, please refer to the Schedule section of Page 1 of this IPOR.

As of the end of this reporting period, IPOC has noted two Adaptation Phase work items as being Past Due:

1. Draft Customizations Documented – Final requirement agreements are still in progress for two customizations: (1) Delegation and (2) Global Changes to Tasks.

2. Implementation Training Team Roles and Responsibilities – Implementation Training Team roles and responsibilities have not been finalized.

Please note that while these items are Past Due, IPOC's current assessment is that their status will not impact the "On Schedule" assessment on page 1 of this report.

IPOC has noted the following item as Deficient in the IPOR Checklist for the month of August:

- Formal staffing plans, including a current organization chart and written roles and responsibilities exist for the Caltrans PRSM Project Team; however the Implementation Vendor has not provided Caltrans with their formal staffing plan, including a schedule for arrival and departure of project staff during the Adaptation Phase.

Project Oversight Review Checklist for August 2009

Project Oversight Review Checklist: High Criticality Project

This checklist is an assessment for the Adaptation Phase. The end date of this phase is March 2010.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Planning and Tracking			
Have the business case, project goals, objectives, expected outcomes, key stakeholders, and sponsor(s) identified and documented?	X		The SPR was approved by the OCIO on September 29, 2008. The Section 11 was submitted and the waiting period ended Dec 5. The appropriate project documents should be updated with the new information from the SPR and Implementation Vendor information. An updated SPR with a new baseline has been drafted and discussed with the OCIO. The draft SPR has been submitted to the Caltrans PMO office for review.
Has a detailed project plan with all activities (tasks), milestones, dates, and estimated hours by task loaded into project management (PM) software? Are the lowest level tasks of a short duration with measurable outcomes?	X		The Implementation Vendor submitted a PRSM Project Implementation Plan during the Planning Phase of the project. The Implementation Plan provides a schedule in MS Project for PRSM Project activities, milestones, and deliverables including start and finish dates, duration, and high level resource assignments for each task in the project. The Implementation Vendor is taking a Rolling Wave approach. Prior to the end of each phase or PRSM Payment Point, the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans will work together to develop the specific activities for the tasks in the next Rolling Wave. The new detailed Rolling Wave Plan for the succeeding Project Phase will be documented in MS Project and will be submitted for State Acceptance as a prerequisite for State Acceptance of the current Payment Point. The detailed Rolling Wave schedules will include lower level tasks, estimated hours to complete, and resource assignments. The Adaptation Phase has been broken into two parts: Part A and Part B. The Implementation Vendor, with the assistance of Caltrans created a detailed Rolling Wave schedule for Adaptation Phase Part A, which references the PRSM WBS. Currently, resource loading into the schedule is still in progress. An overall project WBS/task list of approximately 2,000 items exists in an Excel file.
Is completion of planned tasks recorded within the PM software?	X		The Implementation Vendor is using the Rolling Wave approach. In addition to the PRSM Project Implementation Plan, a detailed project plan will be created in MS Project for each Rolling Wave. The detailed Rolling Wave schedules will be updated to record completion of planned tasks.
Are actual hours expended by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		Actual hours are charged to a WBS number and are recorded and tracked in the Department's official accounting system.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Are estimated hours to complete by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		The Implementation Vendor is using the Rolling Wave approach. In addition to the PRSM Project Implementation Plan, a detailed project plan will be created in MS Project for each Rolling Wave. The detailed Rolling Wave schedules will be updated to record estimated hours to complete tasks. On a weekly basis, current and upcoming tasks are reviewed by the PRSM Project team and the estimated hours to complete the tasks are updated as necessary.
Is there a formal staffing plan, including a current organization chart, written roles and responsibilities, plans for staff acquisition, schedule for arrival and departure of specific staff, and staff training plans		X	Formal staffing plans, including a current organization chart and written roles and responsibilities exist for the Caltrans PRSM Project Team; however the Implementation Vendor has not provided Caltrans with their formal staffing plan, including a schedule for arrival and departure of project staff.
Have project cost estimates, with supporting data for each cost category, been maintained?	X		The latest approved SPR dated September 29, 2008 has reset the baseline.
Are software size estimates developed and tracked?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable at this point of the project.
Are two or more estimation approaches used to refine estimates?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable at this point of the project.
Are independent reviews of estimates conducted?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable at this point of the project.
Are actual costs recorded and regularly compared to budgeted costs?	X		A spreadsheet exists that shows planned and actual costs by month.
Is supporting data maintained for actual costs?	X		Actual costs are obtained from timesheets that allocate time to WBS numbers/tasks.
Is completion status of work plan activities, deliverables, and milestones recorded, compared to schedule and included in a written status reporting process?	X		Beginning in the May 2009 reporting period, PRSM project status meetings have been occurring on a weekly basis versus bi-weekly. During the meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in MS Project for the current phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the current phase. In addition, the status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register. A high-level status report is posted on the Caltrans Improvement Project web database. Status reports go to the Legislature quarterly.
Are key specification documents (e.g. contracts, requirement specifications and/or contract deliverables) and software products under formal configuration control, with items to be controlled and specific staff roles and responsibilities for configuration management identified in a configuration management plan?	X		The Configuration Management Plan deliverable was submitted by the Implementation Vendor to Caltrans during the Planning Phase. After Caltrans and IPOC performed an initial review of the Plan, the Implementation Vendor submitted an updated version. The current Configuration Management Plan, dated 7/19/2009, provides details on configuration management of key project documents and software products.
Are issues/problems and their resolution (including assignment of specific staff responsibility for issue resolution and specific deadlines for completion of resolution activities), formally tracked?	X		An Issue Management Plan was approved and open issues are in the project database. The IT project manager is considering the same tool for managing project changes. Additionally, Caltrans has established an Issues Management Meeting that is held on a monthly basis.
Is user satisfaction assessed at key project milestones?	X		Representatives of the engineering areas and regions participated in the vendor demonstration evaluations. Caltrans is currently scheduling Implementation Team training sessions that will provide the PRSM Implementation Team with an overview of PRSM Methodology and Functionality. After completion of the

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			training, the PRSM Project Team will gather feedback on the content and the effectiveness of the training and will use this feedback to update and/or improve future training sessions. This is adequate for the Adaptation Phase of the project.
Is planning in compliance with formal standards or a system development life-cycle (SDLC) methodology?	X		Compliance with PMBOK standards is adequate for this phase of the project. Seven deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Adaptation Part A Phase: Application Installation Report, Data Initialization Plan, Configuration Plan (High Level WP1 Use Cases), Configuration Plan (Detailed WP1 Design), Training Role Descriptions and Course List, Training and Documentation Plan and Configuration Plan (Interface Architecture). IPOC is planning to review each of these deliverables as they are submitted and will provide comments and feedback.
Is there formal enterprise architecture in place?	X		The RFQI describes the target Caltrans enterprise environment.
Are project closeout activities performed, including a PIER, collection and archiving up-to-date project records and identification of lessons learned?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Adaptation Phase.
Procurement			
Are appropriate procurement vehicles selected (e.g. CMAS, MSA, "alternative procurement") and their required processes followed?	X		The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009.
Is a detailed written scope of work for all services included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed written scope of work is contained in the RFP.
Are detailed requirement specifications included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed requirement specifications are contained in the RFP. Requirements are described in the RFQI and Value Analysis documents.
Is there material participation of outside expertise (e.g. DGS, Departmental specialists, consultants) in procurement planning and execution?	X		Outside expertise and counsel has been sought from DOF, DGS, and consultants.
For large-scale outsourcing, is qualified legal counsel obtained?	N/A	N/A	The project does not involve outsourcing as currently defined.

Risk Management			
Is formal continuous risk management performed, including development of a written risk management plan, identification, analysis, mitigation and escalation of risks in accordance with DOF/TOSU Guidelines, and regular management team review of risks and mitigation progress performed?	X		The latest version of the Risk Management Plan was submitted April 30, 2009. Risk owners have been assigned. A Risk Register was developed and is tracked by the Risk Manager.
Does the management team review risks and mitigation progress at least monthly?	X		Risk Management meetings are being held monthly with the PRSM Project Team where risks and their associated mitigation progress is reviewed.
Are externally developed risk identification aids used, such as the SEI Taxonomy Based Questionnaire?	X		A risk list was initially populated using the SEI Risk Taxonomy. Additional risks are added to the list through input or migration from the issue list.
Communication			
Is there a written project communications plan?	X		The latest version of the finalized and approved Communications Plan is dated

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			6/22/2009.
Are regular written status reports prepared and provided to the project manager, department CIO (if applicable) and other key stakeholders?	X		The Advisory Committee receives a written status report during the monthly Advisory Committee meetings. These reports include issues identified, changes to scope, schedule, cost, problems encountered, and items accomplished.
Are there written escalation policies for issues and risks?	X		Both the Risk Management Plan and the Issue Management Plan contain a risk escalation process.
Is there regular stakeholder involvement in major project decisions, issue resolution and risk mitigation?	X		Implementation Manager meetings occur on a monthly basis. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the District project managers regularly updated on the status of the project and to receive their input.
System Engineering			
Are users involved throughout the project, especially in requirements specification and testing?	X		Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. The PRSM Project Team is being run by Caltrans Division of Project management which is the primary constituency for the system.
Do users formally approve/sign-off on written specifications?	X		The PRSM Advisory Committee is comprised of Caltrans personnel. The Advisory Committee appears to be monitoring the initial planning process. This level of involvement appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Is a formal SDLC methodology followed?	X		The Implementation Vendor is using the SDLC Stage Gate Model to manage the configuration and customization of PRSM throughout the Adaptation Phase. In this model, work packages divide the total effort into a series of stages, where gating criteria must be met prior to moving from one stage to the next. For the PRSM Project, each work package is designed, developed, tested, and accepted prior to completion of the package. This model may have an impact on the schedule, due to the amount of review time for each work package. In order to offset this, Caltrans may need to incorporate the review cycles into the detailed Rolling Wave schedules.
Is a software product used to assist in managing requirements? Is there tracking of requirements traceability through all life-cycle phases?	X		An Implementation and System Acceptance Test consultant has been added to the team. The level of requirements management presently in place appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Do software engineering standards exist and are they followed?	X		Engineering standards exist and are documented in the PRSM Configuration Management Plan. IPOC will monitor the project during the Adaptation Phase and subsequent phases to determine how effectively the PRSM Project is adhering to the engineering standards.
Does product defect tracking begin no later than requirements specifications?	X		The PRSM issue management system currently is designed to serve as a defect tracking mechanism. Several of the issues already raised represent clarification to requirements.
Are formal code reviews conducted?	N/A	N/A	This is not applicable for this phase of the project. However, the PRSM Project Team has planned for formal code reviews for the customizations to occur in the Work Package Development portion of the project.
Are formal quality assurance procedures followed consistently?	X		The PRSM Project follows the State Acceptance process for deliverables. There are three types of Acceptance: Acceptance Type 1 – Objective on Receipt;

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			Acceptance Type 2 – Non-Software Acceptance; and Acceptance Type 3 – Software Acceptance Testing by the State.
Do users sign-off on acceptance test results before a new system or changes are put into production?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Adaptation Phase
Is the enterprise architecture plan adhered to?	X		Caltrans is in the process of creating a formal enterprise architecture plan. The PRSM technology solution was requested to be submitted as part of the study.
Are formal deliverable inspections performed, beginning with requirements specifications?	X		The Implementation Vendor is reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report. The requirements clarification report will be completed in the Adaptation Phase. Previously, the requirements have been through two separate review activities: user group review and IV&V review. There is a third review underway by the Project Management team in order to document the As-Is and To-Be business processes. IPOC will continue to monitor this area as the project progresses.
Are IV&V services obtained and used?	X		The IV&V Contract was approved and the IV&V Vendor began work in April 2008.

IPO Report for July 2009

Independent Project Oversight Report

Project Name: Caltrans PRSM **Assessment Date:** July 31, 2009

Frequency: Monthly

Oversight Provider Information

Oversight Leader:	Greg Thomas	**Organization:**	Deloitte & Touche LLP
Phone Number:	916 288 3232	**Email:**	grethomas@deloitte.com

Project Information

Project Number:	**2660-160**	**Department:**	Transportation (Caltrans)
Criticality:	High	**Agency:**	Business, Transportation & Housing
Last Approved Document/Date:	SPR (09/29/08)	**Total One-time Cost:**	$26,119,068
Start Date:	June 7, 2000	**End Date:**	January 6, 2011
Project Manager:	David Youmans	**Organization:**	Caltrans
Phone Number:	916.826.4425	**Email:**	david_youmans@dot.ca.gov

Summary: Current Status

Project Phase:	Adaptation		
Planned Start Date:	October 7, 2008	**Planned End Date:**	August 21, 2009
Actual Start Date:	July 1, 2009	**Forecasted End Date:**	March 16, 2010

Schedule

Select the statement that most closely applies, measured against the last **Finance approved** document.

Ahead-of-schedule:
One or more major tasks or milestones have been completed and approved early (> 5%). All other major tasks and milestones completed and approved according to plan.

On Schedule

On-schedule:
All major tasks and milestones have been completed and approved according to plan. (Within 5%)

Behind Schedule:
One or more major tasks or milestones are expected to be delayed. (> 5%)

Comments: A new baseline schedule was set with the approved SPR dated September 29, 2008. The SPR states the start date of the Planning Phase as September 2, 2008, however, the final contract was

signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009 The current SPR appears to be inconsistent with the new actual dates. Based on conversations with the Caltrans PRSM IT Project Manager, an updated SPR with a new baseline has been drafted and discussed with the OCIO. The draft SPR has been submitted to the Caltrans PMO office for review. The updated SPR will more accurately reflect the actual start date of the contract.

Based on the draft SPR, the Adaptation Phase was forecasted to end in February 2010. In the July 28, 2009 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Adaptation Phase completion date as March 16, 2010. This represents a difference of one month. Additionally, based on the draft SPR, the PRSM project was forecasted to end on June 13, 2011. In the July 28, 2009 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the PRSM Project completion date as July 1, 2011. This represents an extension of the project by approximately two weeks. Given this minor change in the end date IPOC has reported the project as "On Schedule". We will continue to closely monitor the schedule status during the Adaptation Phase.

Resources (Level of Effort) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Within Resources

Fewer Resources
Completion of one or more major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) fewer hours/staff than planned.

Within Resources
All major tasks have been completed and acceptable products created using the planned number of hours/staff (within 5%).

More Resources
Completion of major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) more hours/staff than planned.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR.

Resources (Budget/Cost) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Within Cost

Less cost
The project is (>5%) under budget.

Within cost
The project is operating within budget.

Higher cost
Material budget increases (>5%) are likely.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR.

Quality (Client Functionality) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined

Adequately Defined
Required client functionality is adequately defined, and is being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Inadequately Defined
One or more significant components of required client functionality are inadequately defined, or are not being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Comments: Functionality is adequately defined for the Adaptation Phase which began on July 1, 2009. The Implementation Vendor is currently reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report, which is due to be completed in August 2009.

Quality (Architecture/System Performance) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined

Adequately Defined
The system technical architecture is adequately defined, and modeling, benchmarking and testing are being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Inadequately Defined
The system technical architecture is not adequately defined, or modeling, benchmarking and testing are not being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Comments: System technical architecture and performance are adequately defined for the Adaptation Phase. The Implementation Vendor has submitted a Configuration Management Plan, High Level Design, and updated Architecture Diagram. Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor are working with DTS to configure the development, testing and training environments. As the project progresses, additional refinement may be necessary.

New Risks

Risk Title: PRSM Project Team Communications

Risk Statement: Effective, clear and frequent communications between the Caltrans PRSM team, the Implementation Vendor, other vendors (e.g., testing and data conversion), and District stakeholder is critical given the size and complexity of PRSM during the Adaptation Phase. The new Communications Plan, while documented, needs to be fully implemented early in the Adaptation Phase. Without effective communications, the PRSM project schedule, scope and quality could be difficult to manage and control.
Probability: Medium Impact: High Time Frame: Long Term Severity: High Assigned to: David Youmans

Recommendations:

- In addition to the weekly PRSM Project Status meetings, IPOC recommends that Caltrans PRSM Project Management and Implementation Vendor Project Management conduct brief "checkpoint" meetings in order to discuss the status of high priority issues and action items. These checkpoint meetings should be no longer than ½ hour in duration and conducted twice per week (i.e., Monday AM and Thursday PM).

Progress Toward Addressing Prior Risks

Risk Title: Timing of Interfaces

Risk Statement: With a new Caltrans financial systems project underway (ERP Financial Infrastructure – "EFIS"), an additional interface will need to be developed. The PRSM project is currently planning to develop an interface to the Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system, which is the Caltrans enterprise financial system that is currently used for operations. The timing for development of the EFIS interface is tentatively planned for September 2009, although the specifications and data requirements are not fully documented at this time. The uncertainties associated with the EFIS interface may have an impact on development and testing resources (potentially increasing development and testing costs) and a potential adverse impact on the project schedule (delay in development of the PRSM solution).

Probability: High Impact: Medium Time Frame: Short Term Severity: High Assigned to: Jacqueline Moore

Recommendations:

- Continue to work closely with the EFIS project by attending the bi-weekly interface planning meetings. Escalate issues related to EFIS timing and resource needs to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution as soon as the interface requirements are finalized.

Status Update:

July 09 Status: No change in the status from June 09.

June 09 Status: The PRSM Project Team is currently attending bi-weekly meetings with the EFIS Project Team to discuss the interface requirements and plan for development of the interface. The PRSM Project Team has been meeting with representatives of EFIS, Staff Central (time reporting), Earned Value Reporting System (EVRS), and FIDO to gain a better understanding of what and how often data will be exchanged between those systems and PRSM

Risk Title: Resource Availability

Risk Statement: Without adequate Caltrans resources working on PRSM, the project implementation schedule could be delayed. While in the Adaptation Phase, PRSM Project Team members should be allocated full time. Individual Resources may need to be identified at the task level in the Project Plan in order to estimate resource requirements and availability.

Probability: Medium Impact: High Time Frame: Short Severity: High Assigned to: TBD

Recommendations:

- After the PRSM work plan is complete, determine the resource gaps and reallocate effort as appropriate.
- Assign individual resources at the task level in the project schedule to assist in estimating resource requirements. All PRSM project resource, including vendor resources, should be included.

Status Update:

July 09 Status: During this reporting period a new Communications Lead was hired by Caltrans. In addition, a new Software Vendor Consultant joined the team and began working on the "to be" business process versus CA Clarity gap analysis. Caltrans is currently working with the Implementation Vendor to create a detailed "Rolling Wave" schedule (see information on this approach in the General Comments section below) for the Adaptation Part A phase. This schedule will include resource assignments at the task level.

June 09 Status: During this reporting period one of the Software Vendor Consultants was unable to work due to illness, which did have an impact on the activities associated with the "to be" business process versus CA Clarity (the Project Management software tool that is being implemented) gap analysis. In the June 30, 2009 Status Meeting, the Implementation Vendor informed the PRSM Project Team that a replacement Software Vendor Consultant will be joining the team in July.

Risk Title: Business Rules and Business Process Changes

Risk Statement: The impact of business changes resulting from the PRSM implementation needs to be sufficiently understood, planned for, and communicated to Caltrans staff. If District field staff are not in agreement with the decisions and consequences of changing/standardizing business rules and business processes, it may have an adverse effect on system acceptance and may disrupt work in progress. This could result in increased resistance to acceptance and usage of the system.

Probability: High Impact: High Time Frame: Med Severity: High Assigned to: David Cordone

Recommendations:

- Implement a formal change management process which will be used for PRSM project related changes. Change management tasks associated with these changes should be incorporated into the project schedule and budget. Changes should be communicated to the key stakeholders.
- Define the process for gaining field consensus on the new business rules and business processes.
- Develop a plan that describes how information on new business rules and business processes will be communicated to the field with sufficient time to get feedback and buy-in.

Status Update:

July 09 Status: During this reporting period, the Draft 'To Be' business process documentation was sent to the Implementation Managers for review and feedback. The PRSM Project Team scheduled meetings with the Implementation Managers to walkthrough the 'To Be' process documentation the weeks of 7/20 and 7/27. In addition, the list of requirements customizations was drafted. The PRSM Project Team held Joint Application Development (JAD) sessions to go over the customizations list. Caltrans is currently in the process of finalizing the customizations.

June 09 Status: The Implementation Vendor is completing their review of the "to be" business process documents. Once the "to be" business process documents have been released to the Districts, a video conference will be scheduled with each District individually to discuss the final processes and rules as well as address any District concerns. PRSM Task Management and Reporting continue to be the key areas that need to be addressed from a business process standpoint. In addition, the PRSM Project Team has been working with the Implementation Vendor to draft a list of requirements that will need customizations. Given the constraints associated with the Software Vendor Consultant (see Resource Availability risk above), the list of draft requirements that will need customization is delayed until July.

General Comments

Deloitte & Touche LLP's IPOC contract with the Caltrans PRSM project started in December 2008. This Independent Project Oversight Report (IPOR) provided by Deloitte & Touche LLP has been developed in accordance with the applicable standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) as per Deloitte & Touche LLP policy.

IPOC has attended various PRSM project meetings throughout the month of July, including the PRSM Implementation Managers meeting, the PRSM Steering Committee meeting, and the PRSM Status meetings.

The PRSM project is in the Adaptation Part A Phase of the project. Seven deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Adaptation Part A Phase: Application Installation Report, Data Initialization Plan, Configuration Plan (High Level WP1 Use Cases), Configuration Plan (Detailed WP1 Design), Training Role Descriptions and Course List, Training and Documentation Plan and Configuration Plan (Interface Architecture). IPOC is planning to review each of these deliverables as they are submitted and will provide comments and feedback.

Beginning in the May 2009 reporting period, PRSM project status meetings have been occurring on a weekly basis versus bi-weekly. During the status meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in Microsoft Project for the Adaptation Part A Phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the Adaptation Part A Phase. In addition, the status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register.

The Implementation Vendor has submitted an Adaptation Phase schedule to Caltrans, which separates the Adaptation Phase into two work packages. Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor may need to have additional discussions regarding the schedule for the Adaptation Phase and the items that belong in each work package. In addition, the Implementation Plan was submitted, which was reviewed by Caltrans, and includes a schedule for the entire project. The Implementation Vendor has proposed a “Rolling Wave” scheduling process for the PRSM project where a more detailed schedule is prepared before the start of each project phase. Prior to the end of each phase or PRSM Payment Point, the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans will work together to develop the specific activities for the tasks in the next Rolling Wave. The new detailed Rolling Wave Plan for the succeeding project phase will be documented in MS Project and will be submitted for State Acceptance as a prerequisite for State Acceptance of the current Payment Point. The detailed Rolling Wave schedules will include lower level tasks, estimated hours to complete, and resource assignments. The Adaptation Phase has been broken into two parts: Part A and Part B. Currently Caltrans is working with the Implementation Vendor to create the detailed project plan for Adaptation Phase Part A, which will reference the PRSM WBS.

Based on the draft SPR, the Adaptation Phase was forecasted to end in February 2010. In the July 28, 2009 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Adaptation Phase completion date as March 16, 2010. This represents a difference of one month. Additionally, based on the draft SPR, the PRSM project was forecasted to end on June 13, 2011. In the July 28, 2009 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the PRSM Project completion date as July 1, 2011. This represents an extension of the project by approximately two weeks. Given this minor change in the end date IPOC has reported the project as “On Schedule”. For more information, please refer to the Schedule section of Page 1 of this IPOR.

As of the end of this reporting period, IPOC has noted two Adaptation Phase work items as being Past Due:

3. DTS Hardware Installation – Production Server equipment have been ordered and will take approximately 150 days for procurement and installation. The schedule may need to be updated to accommodate this.

4. CA Productivity Accelerator (CAPA) Architecture – The submission of the CAPA Architecture was postponed by the Implementation Vendor until the CAPA requirements have been identified.

Please note that while these items are Past Due, IPOC’s current assessment is that their status will not impact the “On Schedule” assessment on page 1 of this report.

IPOC has noted the following item as Deficient in the IPOR Checklist for the month of July:

- Formal staffing plans, including a current organization chart and written roles and responsibilities exist for the Caltrans PRSM Project Team; however the Implementation Vendor has not provided Caltrans with their formal staffing plan, which includes a schedule for arrival and departure of project staff during the Adaptation Phase.

Project Oversight Review Checklist for July 2009

Project Oversight Review Checklist: High Criticality Project

This checklist is an assessment for the Adaptation Phase. The end date of this phase is March 2010.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Planning and Tracking			
Have the business case, project goals, objectives, expected outcomes, key stakeholders, and sponsor(s) identified and documented?	X		The SPR was approved by the OCIO on September 29, 2008. The Section 11 was submitted and the waiting period ended Dec 5. The appropriate project documents should be updated with the new information from the SPR and Implementation Vendor information. An updated SPR with a new baseline has been drafted and discussed with the OCIO. The draft SPR has been submitted to the Caltrans PMO office for review.
Has a detailed project plan with all activities (tasks), milestones, dates, and estimated hours by task loaded into project management (PM) software? Are the lowest level tasks of a short duration with measurable outcomes?	X		The Implementation Vendor submitted a PRSM Project Implementation Plan during the Planning Phase of the project. The Implementation Plan provides a schedule in MS Project for PRSM Project activities, milestones, and deliverables including start and finish dates, duration, and high level resource assignments for each task in the project. The Implementation Vendor is taking a Rolling Wave approach. Prior to the end of each phase or PRSM Payment Point, the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans will work together to develop the specific activities for the tasks in the next Rolling Wave. The new detailed Rolling Wave Plan for the succeeding Project Phase will be documented in MS Project and will be submitted for State Acceptance as a prerequisite for State Acceptance of the current Payment Point. The detailed Rolling Wave schedules will include lower level tasks, estimated hours to complete, and resource assignments. The Adaptation Phase has been broken into two parts: Part A and Part B. Currently Caltrans is working with the Implementation Vendor to create the detailed project plan for Adaptation Phase Part A, which will reference the PRSM WBS. An overall project WBS/task list of approximately 2,000 items exists in an Excel file.
Is completion of planned tasks recorded within the PM software?	X		The Implementation Vendor is using the Rolling Wave approach. In addition to the PRSM Project Implementation Plan, a detailed project plan will be created in MS Project for each Rolling Wave. The detailed Rolling Wave schedules will be updated to record completion of planned tasks.
Are actual hours expended by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		Actual hours are charged to a WBS number and are recorded and tracked in the Department's official accounting system.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Are estimated hours to complete by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		The Implementation Vendor is using the Rolling Wave approach. In addition to the PRSM Project Implementation Plan, a detailed project plan will be created in MS Project for each Rolling Wave. The detailed Rolling Wave schedules will be updated to record estimated hours to complete for tasks. On a weekly basis, current and upcoming tasks are reviewed by the PRSM Project team and the estimated hours to complete the tasks are updated as necessary.
Is there a formal staffing plan, including a current organization chart, written roles and responsibilities, plans for staff acquisition, schedule for arrival and departure of specific staff, and staff training plans		X	Formal staffing plans, including a current organization chart and written roles and responsibilities exist for the Caltrans PRSM Project Team; however the Implementation Vendor has not provided Caltrans with their formal staffing plan, which includes a schedule for arrival and departure of project staff.
Have project cost estimates, with supporting data for each cost category, been maintained?	X		The latest approved SPR dated September 29, 2008 has reset the baseline.
Are software size estimates developed and tracked?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable at this point of the project.
Are two or more estimation approaches used to refine estimates?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable at this point of the project.
Are independent reviews of estimates conducted?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable at this point of the project.
Are actual costs recorded and regularly compared to budgeted costs?	X		A spreadsheet exists that shows planned and actual costs by month.
Is supporting data maintained for actual costs?	X		Actual costs are obtained from timesheets that allocate time to WBS numbers/tasks.
Is completion status of work plan activities, deliverables, and milestones recorded, compared to schedule and included in a written status reporting process?	X		Beginning in the May 2009 reporting period, PRSM project status meetings have been occurring on a weekly basis versus bi-weekly. During the meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in MS Project for the current phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the current phase. In addition, the status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register. A high-level status report is posted on the Caltrans Improvement Project web database. Status reports go to the Legislature quarterly.
Are key specification documents (e.g. contracts, requirement specifications and/or contract deliverables) and software products under formal configuration control, with items to be controlled and specific staff roles and responsibilities for configuration management identified in a configuration management plan?	X		The Configuration Management Plan deliverable was submitted by the Implementation Vendor to Caltrans during the Planning Phase. After Caltrans and IPOC performed an initial review of the Plan, the Implementation Vendor submitted an updated version. The current Configuration Management Plan, dated 7/19/2009, provides details on configuration management of key project documents and software products.
Are issues/problems and their resolution (including assignment of specific staff responsibility for issue resolution and specific deadlines for completion of resolution activities), formally tracked?	X		An Issue Management Plan was approved and open issues are in the project database. The IT project manager is considering the same tool for managing project changes. Additionally, Caltrans has established an Issues Management Meeting that is held on a monthly basis.
Is user satisfaction assessed at key project milestones?	X		Representatives of the engineering areas and regions participated in the vendor demonstration evaluations. Caltrans is currently scheduling Implementation Team

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			training sessions that will provide the PRSM Implementation Team with an overview of PRSM Methodology and Functionality. After completion of the training, the PRSM Project Team will gather feedback on the content and the effectiveness of the training and will use this feedback to update and/or improve future training sessions. This is adequate for the Adaptation Phase of the project.
Is planning in compliance with formal standards or a system development life-cycle (SDLC) methodology?	X		Compliance with PMBOK standards is adequate for this phase of the project. Three deliverables were identified to be completed during the Planning Phase: the Implementation Plan, Training Plan, and Configuration Management Plan.
Is there formal enterprise architecture in place?	X		The RFQI describes the target Caltrans enterprise environment.
Are project closeout activities performed, including a PIER, collection and archiving up-to-date project records and identification of lessons learned?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Adaptation Phase.
Procurement			
Are appropriate procurement vehicles selected (e.g. CMAS, MSA, "alternative procurement") and their required processes followed?	X		The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009.
Is a detailed written scope of work for all services included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed written scope of work is contained in the RFP.
Are detailed requirement specifications included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed requirement specifications are contained in the RFP. Requirements are described in the RFQI and Value Analysis documents.
Is there material participation of outside expertise (e.g. DGS, Departmental specialists, consultants) in procurement planning and execution?	X		Outside expertise and counsel has been sought from DOF, DGS, and consultants.
For large-scale outsourcing, is qualified legal counsel obtained?	N/A	N/A	The project does not involve outsourcing as currently defined.

Risk Management			
Is formal continuous risk management performed, including development of a written risk management plan, identification, analysis, mitigation and escalation of risks in accordance with DOF/TOSU Guidelines, and regular management team review of risks and mitigation progress performed?	X		The latest version of the Risk Management Plan was submitted April 30, 2009. Risk owners have been assigned. A Risk Register was developed and is tracked by the Risk Manager.
Does the management team review risks and mitigation progress at least monthly?	X		Risk Management meetings are being held monthly with the PRSM Project Team where risks and their associated mitigation progress are reviewed.
Are externally developed risk identification aids used, such as the SEI Taxonomy Based Questionnaire?	X		A risk list was initially populated using the SEI Risk Taxonomy. Additional risks are added to the list through input or migration from the issue list.
Communication			
Is there a written project communications plan?	X		The latest version of the draft Communications Plan is dated 6/22/2009. Caltrans

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			is currently in the process of reviewing the plan.
Are regular written status reports prepared and provided to the project manager, department CIO (if applicable) and other key stakeholders?	X		The Advisory Committee receives a written status report during the monthly Advisory Committee meetings. These reports include issues identified, changes to scope, schedule, cost, problems encountered, and items accomplished.
Are there written escalation policies for issues and risks?	X		Both the Risk Management Plan and the Issue Management Plan contain a risk escalation process.
Is there regular stakeholder involvement in major project decisions, issue resolution and risk mitigation?	X		Implementation Manager meetings occur on a monthly basis. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the District project managers regularly updated on the status of the project and to receive their input.
System Engineering			
Are users involved throughout the project, especially in requirements specification and testing?	X		Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. The PRSM Project Team is being run by Caltrans Division of Project management which is the primary constituency for the system.
Do users formally approve/sign-off on written specifications?	X		The PRSM Advisory Committee is comprised of Caltrans personnel. The Advisory Committee appears to be monitoring the initial planning process. This level of involvement appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Is a formal SDLC methodology followed?	X		The Implementation Vendor is using the SDLC Stage Gate Model to manage the configuration and customization of PRSM throughout the Adaptation Phase. In this model, work packages divide the total effort into a series of stages, where gating criteria must be met prior to moving from one stage to the next. For the PRSM Project, each work package is designed, developed, tested, and accepted prior to completion of the package. This model may have an impact on the schedule, due to the amount of review time for each work package. In order to offset this, Caltrans may need to incorporate the review cycles into the detailed Rolling Wave schedules.
Is a software product used to assist in managing requirements? Is there tracking of requirements traceability through all life-cycle phases?	X		An Implementation and System Acceptance Test consultant has been added to the team. The level of requirements management presently in place appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Do software engineering standards exist and are they followed?	X		Engineering standards exist and are documented in the PRSM Configuration Management Plan. IPOC will monitor the project during the Adaptation Phase and subsequent phases to determine how effectively the PRSM Project is adhering to the engineering standards.
Does product defect tracking begin no later than requirements specifications?	X		The PRSM issue management system currently is designed to serve as a defect tracking mechanism. Several of the issues already raised represent clarification to requirements.
Are formal code reviews conducted?	N/A	N/A	This is not applicable for this phase of the project. However, the PRSM Project Team has planned for formal code reviews to occur in the Work Package Development portion of the project.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Are formal quality assurance procedures followed consistently?	X		The PRSM Project follows the State Acceptance process for deliverables. There are three types of Acceptance: Acceptance Type 1 – Objective on Receipt; Acceptance Type 2 – Non-Software Acceptance; and Acceptance Type 3 – Software Acceptance Testing by the State.
Do users sign-off on acceptance test results before a new system or changes are put into production?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Adaptation Phase
Is the enterprise architecture plan adhered to?	X		Caltrans is in the process of creating a formal enterprise architecture plan. The PRSM technology solution was requested to be submitted as part of the study.
Are formal deliverable inspections performed, beginning with requirements specifications?	X		The Implementation Vendor is reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report. The requirements clarification report will be completed in the Adaptation Phase. Previously, the requirements have been through two separate review activities: user group review and IV&V review. There is a third review underway by the Project Management team in order to document the As-Is and To-Be business processes. IPOC will continue to monitor this area as the project progresses.
Are IV&V services obtained and used?	X		The IV&V Contract was approved and the IV&V Vendor began work in April 2008.

IPO Report for June 2009

Independent Project Oversight Report

Project Name: Caltrans PRSM

Assessment Date: June 30, 2009

Frequency: Monthly

Oversight Provider Information

Oversight Leader:	Greg Thomas	**Organization:**	Deloitte & Touche LLP
Phone Number:	916 288 3232	**Email:**	grethomas@deloitte.com

Project Information

Project Number:	**2660-160**	**Department:**	Transportation (Caltrans)
Criticality:	High	**Agency:**	Business, Transportation & Housing
Last Approved Document/Date:	SPR (09/29/08)	**Total One-time Cost:**	$26,119,068
Start Date:	June 7, 2000	**End Date:**	January 6, 2011
Project Manager:	David Youmans	**Organization:**	Caltrans
Phone Number:	916.826.4425	**Email:**	david_youmans@dot.ca.gov

Summary: Current Status

Project Phase:	Planning		
Planned Start Date:	September 2, 2008	**Planned End Date:**	October 6, 2008
Actual Start Date:	March 5, 2009	**Forecasted End Date:**	July 3, 2009

Schedule

Select the statement that most closely applies, measured against the last **Finance approved** document.

On Schedule

Ahead-of-schedule:
One or more major tasks or milestones have been completed and approved early (> 5%). All other major tasks and milestones completed and approved according to plan.

On-schedule:
All major tasks and milestones have been completed and approved according to plan. (Within 5%)

Behind Schedule:
One or more major tasks or milestones are expected to be delayed. (> 5%)

Comments: A new baseline schedule was set with the approved SPR dated September 29, 2008. The SPR states the start date of the Planning Phase as September 2, 2008, however, the final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009 The current SPR appears to be inconsistent with the new actual dates. Based on conversations with the Caltrans PRSM IT Project Manager, an updated SPR with a new baseline has been drafted and discussed with the OCIO. The draft SPR has been submitted to the Caltrans PMO office for review. The updated SPR will more accurately reflect the actual start date of the contract.

Based on the draft SPR and information distributed during the PRSM kick-off meeting, the Planning Phase was forecasted to end in May 2009. In the June 30, 2009 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Planning Phase completion date as July 3, 2009. This represents a difference of two months. Based on conversations with the Caltrans PRSM Project Manager, the PRSM Project Team plans on completing activities scheduled for the Adaptation Phase (the phase after Planning) in parallel with activities in the Planning Phase. At this point in time, the PRSM Project Team does not anticipate the two month delay in the Planning Phase to affect the completion date of the entire project. Based on this information, IPOC has reported the project as "On Schedule", however, we will continue to closely monitor the Planning Phase status and start dates of parallel tasks in the Adaptation Phase.

Resources (Level of Effort) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Within Resources

Fewer Resources
Completion of one or more major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) fewer hours/staff than planned.

Within Resources
All major tasks have been completed and acceptable products created using the planned number of hours/staff (within 5%).

More Resources
Completion of major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) more hours/staff than planned.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR.

Resources (Budget/Cost) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Within Cost

Less cost
The project is (>5%) under budget.

Within cost
The project is operating within budget.

Higher cost
Material budget increases (>5%) are likely.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR.

Quality (Client Functionality) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined

Adequately Defined
Required client functionality is adequately defined, and is being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Inadequately Defined
One or more significant components of required client functionality are inadequately defined, or are not being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Comments: Functionality is adequately defined for the Planning Phase which began on March 5, 2009. The Implementation Vendor is currently reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a

requirements clarification report, which is due to be completed in the Adaptation Phase.

Quality (Architecture/System Performance) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined

Adequately Defined
The system technical architecture is adequately defined, and modeling, benchmarking and testing are being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Inadequately Defined
The system technical architecture is not adequately defined, or modeling, benchmarking and testing are not being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Comments: System technical architecture and performance are adequately defined for the Planning Phase. The Implementation Vendor has submitted a draft Configuration Management Plan and High Level Design. Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor are working with DTS to configure the development, testing and training environments. As the project progresses, additional refinement may be necessary.

New Risks

No new risks this month.

Progress Toward Addressing Prior Risks

Risk Title: Timing of Interfaces

Risk Statement: With a new Caltrans financial systems project underway (ERP Financial Infrastructure – "EFIS"), an additional interface will need to be developed. The PRSM project is currently planning to develop an interface to the Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system, which is the Caltrans enterprise financial system that is currently used for operations. The timing for development of the EFIS interface is tentatively planned for September 2009, although the specifications and data requirements are not fully documented at this time. The uncertainties associated with the EFIS interface may have an impact on development and testing resources (potentially increasing development and testing costs) and a potential adverse impact on the project schedule (delay in development of the PRSM solution).

Probability: High Impact: Medium Time Frame: Short Term Severity: High Assigned to: Jacqueline Moore

Recommendations:

- Continue to work closely with the EFIS project by attending the bi-weekly interface planning meetings. Escalate issues related to EFIS timing and resource needs to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution as soon as the interface requirements are finalized.

Status Update:

June 09 Status: In addition to the May 09 status, the PRSM Project Team has been meeting with representatives of EFIS, Staff Central (time reporting), Earned Value Reporting System (EVRS), and FIDO to gain a better understanding of what and how often data will be exchanged between those systems and PRSM.

May 09 Status: The PRSM Project Team is currently attending bi-weekly meetings with the EFIS Project Team to discuss the interface requirements and plan for development of the interface. Two items on the PRSM Project Plan regarding interfaces were moved out of the Planning Phase and will be placed in a more appropriate phase, when the interface points will be more stable. The two items were: Develop Baseline Interface Design Specification and Interface Modeled into Business Process.

Risk Title: Resource Availability

Risk Statement: Without adequate Caltrans resources working on PRSM, the project implementation schedule could be delayed. While in the Planning Phase, some of the PRSM Project Team members are allocated part time. The resource needs are likely to change when the project shifts to the Implementation Phase.

Probability: Medium Impact: High Time Frame: Short Severity: High Assigned to: TBD

Recommendations:

- After the PRSM work plan is complete, determine the resource gaps and reallocate effort as appropriate.

Status Update:

June 09 Status: During this reporting period one of the Software Vendor Consultants was unable to work due to illness, which did have an impact on the activities associated with the "to be" business process versus CA Clarity (the Project Management software tool that is being implemented) gap analysis. In the June 30, 2009 Status Meeting, the Implementation Vendor informed the PRSM Project Team that a replacement Software Vendor Consultant will be joining the team in July.

May 09 Status: As part of the Planning Phase of the project and in conjunction with the Implementation Vendor, the PRSM Project Team will establish possible changes to resource needs and roles/responsibilities. On May 19, 2009, the Implementation Vendor requested different critical path resources for the following functions: Configuration, Interfaces, and Data Conversion. The Business Project Manager is still acting as the interim publicity /communications manager until the position can be filled.

Risk Title: Business Rules and Business Process Changes

Risk Statement: The impact of business changes resulting from the PRSM implementation needs to be sufficiently understood, planned for, and communicated to Caltrans staff. If District field staff are not in agreement with the decisions and consequences of changing/standardizing business rules and business processes, it may have an adverse effect on system acceptance and may disrupt work in progress. This could result in increased resistance to acceptance and usage of the system.

Probability: High Impact: High Time Frame: Med Severity: High Assigned to: David Cordone

Recommendations:

- Implement a formal change management process which will be used for PRSM project related changes. Change management tasks associated with these changes should be incorporated into the project schedule and budget. Changes should be communicated to the key stakeholders.
- Define the process for gaining field consensus on the new business rules and business processes.
- Develop a plan that describes how information on new business rules and business processes will be communicated to the field with sufficient time to get feedback and buy-in.

Status Update:

June 09 Status: In addition to the May 09 status, the PRSM Project Team has been working with the Implementation Vendor to draft a list of requirements that will need customizations. Given the constraints associated with the Software Vendor Consultant (see Resource Availability risk above), the list of draft requirements that will need customization is delayed until July.

May 09 Status: The Implementation Vendor is completing their review of the "to be" business process documents. Once the "to be" business process documents have been released to the Districts, a video conference will be scheduled with each District individually to discuss the final processes and rules as well as address any District concerns. PRSM Task Management and Reporting continue to be the key areas that need to be addressed from a business process standpoint.

General Comments

Deloitte & Touche LLP's IPOC contract with the Caltrans PRSM project started in December 2008. This Independent Project Oversight Report (IPOR) provided by Deloitte & Touche LLP has been developed in accordance with the applicable standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) as per Deloitte & Touche LLP policy.

IPOC has attended various PRSM project meetings throughout the month of June, including the PRSM Implementation Managers meeting, the PRSM Steering Committee meeting, and the PRSM Status meetings.

The PRSM project is in the Planning Phase of the project. Three deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Planning Phase: the Implementation Plan, Training Plan, and Configuration Management Plan. The Implementation Vendor has submitted draft versions of the Implementation Plan, Training Plan, and Configuration Management Plan to Caltrans for review. IPOC has reviewed each of the plans and has provided comments to Caltrans. Caltrans is currently in the process of organizing all of the reviewer comments for each of the plans and will submit a compiled list to the Implementation Vendor.

Beginning in the May 2009 reporting period, PRSM project status meetings have been occurring on a weekly basis versus bi-weekly. During the status meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in Microsoft Project for the Planning Phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the Planning Phase. In addition, the status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register.

The next phase of the project (Adaptation Phase) is currently scheduled to begin on July 1, 2009. The Implementation Vendor has submitted a draft Adaptation Phase schedule to Caltrans for review, which separates the Adaptation Phase into two work packages. Caltrans and the Implementation Vendor may need to have additional discussions regarding the schedule for the Adaptation Phase and the items that belong in each work package. In addition, the draft Implementation Plan was submitted for review, which includes a schedule for the entire project. The Implementation Vendor has proposed a “rolling wave” scheduling process for the PRSM project where a more detailed schedule is prepared before the start of each project phase. Caltrans is currently reviewing the scheduling approach and overall project schedule and will provide feedback to the Implementation Vendor.

Based on conversations with the Caltrans PRSM IT Project Manager, an updated SPR with a new baseline is being drafted. Based on the draft SPR and information distributed during the PRSM Kick-off meeting, the Planning Phase was forecasted to end in May 2009. In the June 30, 2009 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Planning Phase completion date as July 3, 2009. This represents a difference of two months. Based on conversations with the Caltrans PRSM Project Manager, although the Planning Phase schedule has been extended by two months, the PRSM Project Team plan on completing several activities in parallel. For more information, please refer to the Schedule section of Page 1 of this IPOR.

In the May 2009 IPOR, IPOC noted three Planning Phase work items as being Past Due. Listed below is an updated status for each of the items:

5. ‘To Be’ Business Process Refinement – The ‘to be’ process refinement effort was delayed by a week due to an Implementation Vendor Consultant illness. The Implementation Vendor is currently in the process of completing this activity.
   June 09 Status: The ‘To Be’ Business Process Refinement effort has been postponed to the Adaptation Phase.

6. DTS Hardware Installation – There were two issues associated with the PRSM server at DTS that created a delay in getting the development environment fully operational: An unsupported Operating System version was installed at DTS and access to certain network ports were closed. Currently, DTS has resolved those issues and the Software Vendor Consultant is in the process of configuring three instances of PRSM: Development, Test, and Training.
   June 09 Status: During this reporting period, an “HTTP 404” error in the PRSM development environment has occurred. The Implementation Vendor has been granted access to the environment in order to troubleshoot the error. In addition, Caltrans has identified that a change order will need to be issued to DTS for installation of virtual services to allow Business Objects to connect to the three environments: Development, Test, and Training.

7. Rollout Order – The PRSM District rollout order has not been finalized. The rollout order will consist of seven “clusters” of sites; however, the order of those clusters has not yet been identified.
   June 09 Status: The PRSM Project Team has finalized a rollout order and has communicated the order to the Districts.

Please note that while these items are Past Due, IPOC’s current assessment is that their status will not impact the “On Schedule” assessment on page 1 of this report.

Project Oversight Review Checklist for March 2009

Project Oversight Review Checklist: High Criticality Project

This checklist is an assessment for the Planning Phase. The end date of this phase is July 2009.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Planning and Tracking			
Have the business case, project goals, objectives, expected outcomes, key stakeholders, and sponsor(s) identified and documented?	X		The SPR was approved by the OCIO on September 29, 2008. The Section 11 was submitted and the waiting period ended Dec 5. The appropriate project documents should be updated with the new information from the SPR and Implementation Vendor information. An updated SPR with a new baseline has been drafted and discussed with the OCIO. The draft SPR has been submitted to the Caltrans PMO office for review.
Has a detailed project plan with all activities (tasks), milestones, dates, and estimated hours by task loaded into project management (PM) software? Are the lowest level tasks of a short duration with measurable outcomes?	X		During the Planning Phase, the Implementation Vendor is working with Caltrans to update the detailed project plan in MS Project to more accurately reflect and track project tasks, milestones, dates, and estimated hours. The Planning Phase WBS with approximately 60 tasks has been entered in MS Project. An overall project WBS/task list of approximately 2,000 items exists in an Excel file. These activities are appropriate for the Planning Phase of the project.
Is completion of planned tasks recorded within the PM software?	X		During the Planning Phase, the Implementation Vendor is working with Caltrans to update the detailed project plan in MS Project to more accurately track completion of planned tasks. This is appropriate for the Planning Phase of the project.
Are actual hours expended by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		Actual hours are charged to a WBS number and are recorded and tracked in the Department's official accounting system.
Are estimated hours to complete by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?		X	For the Planning Phase the project has begun to track estimated hours to complete in MS Project. Estimated hours to complete are currently not being recorded within PM software for the overall PRSM WBS. A draft WBS work plan for the entire project is being created which will be used going forward to track tasks, estimated hours, dependencies, and resources. The PRSM Project Team is planning to use the PM software that was proposed in the Implementation Vendor's contract (MS Project).
Is there a formal staffing plan, including a current organization chart, written roles and responsibilities, plans for staff acquisition, schedule for arrival and departure of specific staff, and staff training plans		X	The project organization has changed and applicable documents should be updated.
Have project cost estimates, with supporting data for each cost category, been maintained?	X		The latest approved SPR dated September 29, 2008 has reset the baseline.
Are software size estimates developed and tracked?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the new WBS is developed.
Are two or more estimation approaches used to refine estimates?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the new WBS is

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			developed.
Are independent reviews of estimates conducted?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the new WBS is developed.
Are actual costs recorded and regularly compared to budgeted costs?	X		A spreadsheet exists that shows planned and actual costs by month.
Is supporting data maintained for actual costs?	X		Actual costs are obtained from timesheets that allocate time to WBS numbers/tasks.
Is completion status of work plan activities, deliverables, and milestones recorded, compared to schedule and included in a written status reporting process?	X		Beginning in the May 2009 reporting period, PRSM project status meetings have been occurring on a weekly basis versus bi-weekly. During the meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in MS Project for the Planning Phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the Planning Phase. In addition, the status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register. A high-level status report is posted on the Caltrans Improvement Project web database. Status reports go to the Legislature quarterly.
Are key specification documents (e.g. contracts, requirement specifications and/or contract deliverables) and software products under formal configuration control, with items to be controlled and specific staff roles and responsibilities for configuration management identified in a configuration management plan?	X		The development of the Configuration Management Plan is a deliverable that was created in the Planning Phase. The Implementation Vendor submitted the Draft Configuration Management Plan for review on 6/18/2009. IPOC reviewed the Plan and submitted comments to Caltrans. Caltrans is currently in the process of organizing all of the comments and will submit a compiled list of comments to the Implementation Vendor. Once the Implementation Vendor receives the comments, the Configuration Management Plan will be revised and a Final version of the Plan will be submitted.
Are issues/problems and their resolution (including assignment of specific staff responsibility for issue resolution and specific deadlines for completion of resolution activities), formally tracked?	X		An Issue Management Plan was approved and open issues are in the project database. The IT project manager is considering the same tool for managing project changes. Additionally, Caltrans has established an Issues Management Meeting that is held on a monthly basis.
Is user satisfaction assessed at key project milestones?	X		Representatives of the engineering areas and regions participated in the vendor demonstration evaluations. This is adequate for the Planning Phase of the project.
Is planning in compliance with formal standards or a system development life-cycle (SDLC) methodology?	X		Compliance with PMBOK standards is adequate for this phase of the project. Three deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Planning Phase: the Implementation Plan, Training Plan, and Configuration Management Plan.
Is there formal enterprise architecture in place?	X		The RFQI describes the target Caltrans enterprise environment.
Are project closeout activities performed, including a PIER, collection and archiving up-to-date project records and identification of lessons learned?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase.
Procurement			
Are appropriate procurement vehicles selected (e.g. CMAS, MSA, “alternative procurement”) and their required processes followed?	X		The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Is a detailed written scope of work for all services included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed written scope of work is contained in the RFP.
Are detailed requirement specifications included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed requirement specifications are contained in the RFP. Requirements are described in the RFQI and Value Analysis documents.
Is there material participation of outside expertise (e.g. DGS, Departmental specialists, consultants) in procurement planning and execution?	X		Outside expertise and counsel has been sought from DOF, DGS, and consultants.
For large-scale outsourcing, is qualified legal counsel obtained?	N/A	N/A	The project does not involve outsourcing as currently defined.

Risk Management			
Is formal continuous risk management performed, including development of a written risk management plan, identification, analysis, mitigation and escalation of risks in accordance with DOF/TOSU Guidelines, and regular management team review of risks and mitigation progress performed?	X		The latest version of the Risk Management Plan was submitted April 30, 2009. Risk owners have been assigned. A Risk Register was developed and is tracked by the Risk Manager.
Does the management team review risks and mitigation progress at least monthly?	X		Risk management sessions are being held regularly with the team during the procurement phase.
Are externally developed risk identification aids used, such as the SEI Taxonomy Based Questionnaire?	X		A risk list was initially populated using the SEI Risk Taxonomy. Additional risks are added to the list through input or migration from the issue list.
Communication			
Is there a written project communications plan?	X		The Communication Plan was updated to reflect the new organization and implementation strategy. A draft PRSM Communications Matrix was sent out on April 30, 2009 for review. The Implementation Vendor submitted a Draft Communications Plan for the PRSM Project Team to review. Feedback and comments were collected by the PRSM Project Team and submitted to the Implementation Vendor. The feedback and comments were incorporated into the document and an updated version was submitted to the PRSM Project Team for review.
Are regular written status reports prepared and provided to the project manager, department CIO (if applicable) and other key stakeholders?	X		The Advisory Committee receives a written status report during the monthly Advisory Committee meetings. These reports include issues identified, changes to scope, schedule, cost, problems encountered, and items accomplished.
Are there written escalation policies for issues and risks?	X		Both the Risk Management Plan and the Issue Management Plan contain a risk escalation process.
Is there regular stakeholder involvement in major project decisions, issue resolution and risk mitigation?	X		Implementation Manager meetings occur on a monthly basis. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the District project managers regularly updated on the status of the project and to receive their input.
System Engineering			
Are users involved throughout the project, especially in requirements specification and testing?	X		Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. The PRSM Project Team

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			is being run by Caltrans Division of Project management which is the primary constituency for the system.
Do users formally approve/sign-off on written specifications?	X		The PRSM Advisory Committee is comprised of Caltrans personnel. The Advisory Committee appears to be monitoring the initial planning process. This level of involvement appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Is a formal SDLC methodology followed?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the Configuration Management Plan and new WBS is near completion.
Is a software product used to assist in managing requirements? Is there tracking of requirements traceability through all life-cycle phases?	X		An Implementation and System Acceptance Test consultant has been added to the team. The level of requirements management presently in place appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Do software engineering standards exist and are they followed?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Does product defect tracking begin no later than requirements specifications?	X		The PRSM issue management system currently is designed to serve as a defect tracking mechanism. Several of the issues already raised represent clarification to requirements.
Are formal code reviews conducted?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Are formal quality assurance procedures followed consistently?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Do users sign-off on acceptance test results before a new system or changes are put into production?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase
Is the enterprise architecture plan adhered to?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Planning Phase and this item will be assessed as the plans are near completion.
Are formal deliverable inspections performed, beginning with requirements specifications?	X		During the Planning Phase, the Implementation Vendor is reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report. The requirements clarification report will be completed in the Adaptation Phase. Previously, the requirements have been through two separate review activities: user group review and IV&V review. There is a third review underway by the Project Management team in order to document the As-Is and To-Be business processes. IPOC will continue to monitor this area as the project progresses.
Are IV&V services obtained and used?	X		The IV&V Contract was approved and the IV&V vendor began work in April 2008.