Alignment of Framework Deliverables to Audit Recommendations

In 2011 September, the Notice of Motion below was approved. The Corporate Project Management Framework program was created in response to this motion. Since that time the program has been engaged in delivering solutions to the corporation to address the Notice of Motion and subsequent recommendations from the City Auditor's Office.

Notice of Motion NM2011-33

WHEREAS the Audit Committee report on the 16th Avenue Urban Corridor project identified gaps in the project management processes in the City of Calgary;

AND WHEREAS there have been challenges across multiple City Departments, from transportation to parks, with delivering capital projects on time and on budget, leading to the inconvenience of the public

AND WHEREAS delays and cost overruns could be alleviated with proper project management processes, including stakeholder identification, upfront community consultation and change order and risk management;

AND WHEREAS the application of project management processes and the use of The City's project management team differ from department to department, project to project;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that City Council direct the City Manager to report on steps taken to improve the corporate project management model and report to Council through the Standing Policy Committee of Finance and Corporate Services by the first quarter of 2012.

Alignment of Framework Deliverables to Audit Recommendations

This following list is a summary of audit recommendations to the City Manager, Information & Infrastructure Services and the Corporate Project Management Center (CPMC) that have specifically recommended actions related to the Corporate Project Management Framework (CPMF). The responses describe work completed or underway up to 2015 February to address the recommendations:

16 Avenue North Urban Corridor Project Audit June 27, 2011	Response: Corporate Project Management Framework Action
Recommendation 1: The City Manager develop and implement a mandatory project management methodology for capital construction projects. The methodology should include but not be limited to:	
• A requirement for a business case setting out why (in quantifiable terms) the project is required, and showing why the option pursued is the best option for The City to resolve the issue. The business case should include measurable project objectives that can be measured at project close to determine the success of the project.	• Phase 1 - Business Case standard and guidance implemented 2013 February which includes a decision section that encompasses details of option analysis regarding alternatives and success criteria.
• A comprehensive planning process, including a requirement to detail timelines and budget at an appropriate scale for the project, identify dependencies, critical path items and contingencies, develop and communicate roles and responsibilities, and to set a series of formal project checkpoints with required deliverables. Any inspection processes required to complete projects must be included in the plan, as well as quality activities required to ensure that the completed project is fit for purpose.	• Phase 1 - Charter and Plan standard and guidance implemented 2013 February inclusive of timelines and budgets. • Phase 2 – A research project on stage gating – a process of formal project check-points for high risk projects – was undertaken on behalf of the Steering Committee. The report proposed a potential model for stage gating at The City. • Phase 3 – A pilot project is in progress to engage business units in the process of stage gating by designing and conducting stage gate review meeting and reporting on the findings. • Phase 3 – Research was conducted on the practice of Value Management and how it might be used at The City to develop creative solutions for some types of projects. The project team will report their findings to the CPMF Steering Committee.
• A proactive risk management process covering the whole project lifecycle, including the creation of a formal risk register which is updated throughout the project lifespan, and documentation of mitigating actions, monitoring of actions and the results/decisions.	• Phase 2 – Project Risk Management standard and guidance implemented 2014 April.

Alignment of Framework Deliverables to Audit Recommendations

16 Avenue North Urban Corridor Project Audit June 27, 2011	Response: Corporate Project Management Framework Action
• A system of regular reporting to management on progress against the original approved timelines/budget/scope/quality and checkpoints, reasons for any variances, a review of risks and mitigating actions, and summary of issues (affecting time, budget and quality/scope) that arose. Meetings to discuss the reports, including actions arising, should be documented to ensure that issue resolution can be tracked.	• Phase 1 - Progress Report standard and guidance implemented 2013 February. • Project Management Quality Assurance processes, tools and reporting process refined and deployed between 2014 October and 2015 February.
• Appropriate tools and techniques should be developed to support the methodology, including an evaluation of financial systems available to support the project manager to record project commitments, track expenditure and variances etc.	• Project Management Information Systems (ProMIS) – architecture has been developed and approved for tools to aid project management. • Project Management Information Systems (ProMIS) funded as part of Action Plan 2015-18 and is currently engaged in the process of developing scope documents and a charter. • Reporting Dashboard – completed concept development and pilot in 2013, with rollout to ALT completed in 2014. • PeopleSoft Project Costing – deliverables transferred to ProMIS initiative.

Alignment of Framework Deliverables to Audit Recommendations

Calgary Fire Department Facilities Construction Sept 12, 2011	Response: Corporate Project Management Framework Action
Recommendation 4: To ensure a consistent approach across The City, the Director Infrastructure & Information Services develop and implement a City capital cost estimating template/tool based on best practice.	• Phase 1 - Estimating and Contingency standard and guidance implemented 2013 February.
Recommendation 6: The Director, Infrastructure & Information Services improve project management processes for capital projects funded by multiple Departments by:	
• Defining project managers' roles and responsibilities; and	• Project Manager's competency profile created in 2011. • Phase 2 - Project Governance and Team Roles and Responsibilities standard and guidance implemented 2014 April.
• Ensuring capital budgets are aligned with project accountability.	• Phase 1 – Business Case, Charter, Plan and Progress Reporting standards and guidance implemented 2013 February; ongoing tracking of deliverables to plan and costs to budget. • Phase 2 - Project Governance and Team Roles and Responsibilities standard implemented. • Reporting Dashboard pilot completed in 2013 – rolled out to ALT in early 2014

Alignment of Framework Deliverables to Audit Recommendations

Technology Investment Governance Audit December 12, 2012	Response: Corporate Project Management Framework Action
Recommendation 3: The City Auditor's Office recommends the City Manager incorporate the following requirements for Technology projects as part of the Corporate Project Management framework:	
• Require roles, responsibilities and accountabilities to be defined for each project	• Phase 2 – Project Governance and Team Roles and Responsibilities standard and guidance implemented 2014 April; established mandatory requirements for project governance and defining project team roles and responsibilities.
• Require communication plans to be completed	• Phase 1 – Project Charter and Plan standards and guidance implemented 2013 February; documentation required for project communications plan beginning with an overview as part of Charter and a detailed plan in the Project Plan.
• Require consistent storage of project documents	• Phase 1 – Records and Information Management standard and guidance implemented 2013 February.

• Require business cases to provide strong justification for why projects are completed and contain:
  o Discussion/rational for method of delivery (build/buy/reuse)
  o Articulation of defined benefits and costs (i.e. lifecycle, downstream impacts, etc.) arising from projects
  o Consideration of the impact of business changes and project risks
  o Articulation for technology projects of implementation approach, downstream impacts/program dependencies, Enterprise Architecture compliance, security policy, project sponsor, governance approach
	• Phase 1 - Business Case standard and guidance implemented 2013 February which includes a decision section that encompasses details of option analysis regarding alternatives and success criteria.
	• Phase 2 – Project Risk Management standard and guidance implemented 2014 April.

• Require completion of lessons learned for each project.	• 2015 Projects – This scope for a project is currently being drafted for consideration by the Steering Committee at a planning session on 2015 March 05.

Alignment of Framework Deliverables to Audit Recommendations

West LRT Audit July 17, 2013 Recommendation	Response: Corporate Project Management Framework Action
Recommendation 1: The City Manager enhance the Corporate Project Management Framework by adding the requirement for requests for project funding/approval from Council to include:	
• Information on scope of project as it relates to the budget request.	• Phase 1 - Business Case standard and guidance implemented 2013 February; "Project/Opportunity Description" section requires inclusion of details on the scope of the project. "Financial Summary" section includes a requirement to apply the Estimation and Contingency standard.
• Assumptions underlying the budget request, including but not limited to the class of estimate and consequential range of estimation, contingency, etc.	• Phase 1 - Business Case standard and guidance implemented 2013 February; "Project/Opportunity Description" section requires details on the scope of the project.
• Information on comparative projects as applicable.	• Phase 1 - Business Case standard and guidance implemented 2013 February; "Decision" section requires details of the analysis completed on a project including alternatives considered.
• Information on changes that have led to a budget adjustment request	• Phase 2 – Project Change Control standard and guidance implemented 2014 April; requires documenting, analyzing impact (including costs) and obtaining approval for changes.

Flood Recovery Expenditure Sept 3, 2014 Recommendation	
A CPMF (Corporate Project Management Framework) for disaster events could be incorporated into Business Unit's business disaster and business continuity plans and shared with CEMA.	
Recommendation 8: We recommend that the Director, Infrastructure & Information Service investigate implementing corporate project management guidelines and templates for disaster events.	
• Infrastructure & Information Services through the Corporate Project Management Framework (CPMF) will undertake work to review the application of existing CPMF standards as well as other corporate templates in respect to disaster events and advise the Priorities and Finance Committee (PFC) regarding its findings no later than the end of Q2, 2015.	• Q1 – 2015 Convened a group consisting of representation from the Corporate Project Management Center (CPMC), Community Services and Protective (CS&PS), Calgary Emergency Management Agency (CEMA), and the Recovery Operations Centre (ROC) to create a plan to address this request and prepare to report to PFC.
• Implement corporate project management guidelines and templates, inclusive of document management, for disaster events as approved by the PFC.	• TBD based on results of the above (Target date Dec 31/15)