Contract Management - Reviewing Deliverables

Contract Main

When the contractor submits a deliverable for approval, the item must be logged, reviewed and any comments tracked to resolution. When the approval is finally received, the project should send a letter of acceptance to the contractor. All versions of deliverables should be kept for historical purposes along with documented comments and agreements regarding those comments.

A documented Deliverable Review and Management process is recommended to ensure all parties understand their role. The process must ensure that the deliverable is reviewed in a timely manner and examined to determine if the deliverable met all its contractual requirements. In many cases, a **Deliverable Expectation Document (DED) or Data Item Description (DID)** is used to clarify the expectations of the deliverable prior to submission. The process should address who is ultimately responsible for accepting the deliverable, what criteria will be used for evaluation, what deliverable acceptance means, and what to do in the event the deliverable does not meet the contractual expectations.

In some cases, interim or informal reviews of sections or whole deliverables may be appropriate to establish correct level of detail and organization of materials.

The general steps for deliverable review are as follows.

1. Log the deliverable into the tracking system. Note the date of receipt and make copies for the library. Store the electronic version in the document management system. (Deliverable Monitor or Clerical)
2. Route the deliverable to the appropriate list of reviewers based on the DED or other predetermined criteria. Note the review due date, to whom comments should be returned and if there are dependencies on other deliverables. Indicate the associated DED/DID, industry and government standards, applicable contract clauses, and expectations from the SOW that should be used to review the document, as applicable.
3. If federal review/approval is required, submit the deliverable to the appropriate federal contact(s). Note in the tracking system the transmittal/submission date, whom the deliverable was sent to (including CCs/BCCs), when a response was received, and any comments. (Deliverable Monitor)
4. Review the deliverable for correctness, completeness and appropriate level of detail. Use the **general deliverable review criteria** to help determine if the deliverable meets expectations. Submit comments on the deliverable to the Functional Manager or Lead Reviewer. (Reviewers)
5. When the comments have been received, the Functional Manager (or designated Lead Reviewer) reviews the comments and determines if there are any critical comments that must be addressed prior to deliverable acceptance. (Functional Manager or Lead Reviewer)
6. If comments must be addressed, review the contract, HHSDC's processes, and the State guidelines for the deliverable dispute process. If the deliverable is unacceptable and there are associated damages, consult the Project Manager, Legal, and DGS to determine how to proceed.

   Prepare a letter to the contractor indicating the comments, rationale for disapproval, consequences of disapproval (e.g., delayed start of next phase, etc.) and next steps. Only the Project Manager (or formally designated State official) may sign the dispute/comments letter. A copy should be saved to the contract file. Remind the contractor that any associated invoice will not be paid until the deliverable is approved. (Functional Manager or Lead Reviewer)
7. Throughout the review process, track the status of the review in the tracking system. Note the date the review was started, the review due date, and when the item was approved or disputed. Any minor issues may be recorded and tracked to completion in the Issue Tracking System. (Deliverable Monitor)

   Collect and track review and deliverable metrics. Discuss any negative trends or concerns with the Project Manager and the contractor. (Deliverable Monitor)

If appropriate, modify the review and submission process to remove bottlenecks or breakdowns, or instruct the contractor to submit a **Corrective Action Plan (CAP)** (MS Word) or revised process description to address the problem. (Functional or Contract Manager)

8. When a revised deliverable is submitted, repeat steps 1-6 but do not remove or alter information related to the first deliverable.
9. When the deliverable is ready for approval, prepare a letter of deliverable acceptance. If the acceptance is part of a milestone criteria or other pending action, explicitly state how the deliverable acceptance affects the pending action/decision (e.g., does the acceptance close the phase/milestone?). Obtain a State Manager's signature (usually the Contract Manager or Project Manager) on the letter. Make a copy for the contract file and submit the letter to the contractor. (Deliverable Monitor)

Metrics and Tracking Data

The following are some suggested metrics to assist with tracking. Metrics should be collected for all deliverables, and then accumulated to show trends by date period (month, quarter, year), project phase (requirements, design, etc.), and, in some cases, by project area (case management, out-of-state interfaces, etc.), contractor or type of deliverable.

- Number of days to process a deliverable
- Number of deliverables received on-time
- Number of deliverables received late
- Number of deliverables approved
- Number of deliverables disputed/disapproved
- Number of comments per deliverable (may also sort by type or category of deliverable)
- Number of deliverables submitted for Federal review/approval

Samples and Supporting Materials

- **CCSA Deliverable Management Process** (pdf)
- **CalWIN Deliverable Development, Review and Approval Process** (pdf)
- **CalWIN Deliverable Submission Process** (pdf)
- **C-IV Deliverable Development, Production and Review Procedures** (pdf)
- **DCSS IV&V Deliverable Management Process** (MS Word)
- **EBT Deliverable Management Process** (MS Word)
- **EBT Deliverable Review Comment Form** (MS Word)
- **SAWS Deliverable Review Process** (pdf)
- **SAWS Deliverable Review Strategy** (pdf)
- SFIS Deliverable Document Evaluation (DDE) Form (MS Word)
    - SFIS Sample DDE for an Ops Plan (MS Word)
    - SFIS Sample DDE for an Acceptable Format for Recovery Plan (MS Word)
    - SFIS Sample DDE for a Conditional Acceptance of Recovery Plan (MS Word)

Contract Management - General Deliverable Review Criteria

Contract Main

Regardless of the type of the deliverable, these general criteria should be considered.

Content Criteria

1. Is the deliverable clearly written or presented?
2. Is the deliverable at the appropriate and agreed upon level of detail?
3. Is the deliverable written or presented for the appropriate audience? Is there an assumed level of expertise or knowledge needed to use/understand the deliverable? Is this assumption clearly explained and justified? Is this assumption appropriate for this deliverable?
4. Does the deliverable meet the criteria and expectations from the DED/DID, SOW and/or contract? Have all mandatory items/sections been adequately addressed?
5. Does the deliverable meet the cited/applicable industry and government standards?
6. If the deliverable is dependent or related to another deliverable, is it clear why there is a dependency? Is the dependency appropriate?
7. Does the deliverable contribute towards the maintenance of the system? Is there sufficient information to assist the maintenance and operations staff?
8. Is the deliverable maintainable in its present form by the maintenance and operations staff?
9. Has the requirements traceability matrix/tool been updated to indicate where this document satisfies or traces to the requirements (both system and contractual)?
10. Does the deliverable meet the acceptance criteria from the DED/DID, SOW, contract, etc.?
11. Does the deliverable meet the expectations for its intended use?

Administrative Criteria

1. Was it delivered on time? If not, did the Project Manager grant a waiver for the late delivery PRIOR to the deliverable submission?
2. Does the deliverable meet the expectations for size/length?
3. Were the expected number of copies delivered?
4. Was the deliverable submitted in the agreed upon format, media and version?
5. Does the deliverable clearly identify the deliverable requirement and/or contract requirement that it is associated with? (Either by title, document or deliverable number, WBS number, or contract clause number)

6. Were there performance metrics collected for this deliverable review? If so, do the metrics indicate any negative trends or concerns? Are there reasonable explanations for the trends or problems (such as large numbers of sick staff, known equipment failures, large number of recently incorporated scope changes, etc.)?