

City of Portland

Technology Oversight Committee Quality Assurance Guidelines

1 About this document

This document defines the Quality Assurance (QA) services and deliverables required by the City of Portland Technology Oversight Committee of selected quality assurance vendors to support its role to provide oversight to selected city project. These guidelines will enable all quality assurance vendors to provide services in a and Planning¹ and State of New Mexico Department of Information Technology² as well as other examples of QA services on projects within the city like the Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program³. See Section 5 - Reference Materials for more information.

For the purposes of this document “Contractor” refers to the firm on selected and under contract to provide quality assurance services to the Technology Oversight Committee.

This document is posted online at: <http://www.portlandonline.com/omf/index.cfm?c=56407>

2 Authority

As directed by council resolution 36844 the City of Portland Office of Management and Finance(OMF) is responsible for creating an independent citizen oversight committee for specific City of Portland technology projects. The Bureau of Technology Services Administrative Rule BTS-1.07 Technology Project Oversight defines *City’s business practices. The City will adopt an approach to these projects that applies project management, citizen oversight and quality assurance. One component of project oversight will be addressed through ongoing review from an independent citizen Technology Oversight Committee (TOC). One component of quality assurance will be addressed by having projects contract for services with a qualified, external quality assurance firm.”*

3 Introduction to the QA Guidelines

3.1 Purpose

The purpose of the QA guidelines is to establish common, repeatable standards for the delivery of QA services and deliverables for all QA efforts done on behalf of the Technology Oversight Committee.

3.2 Quality Assurance Approach

To ensure that the appropriate quality management and risk management activities are conducted these guidelines are based on the Project Management Institute’s (PMI) Standard as described in the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK), Fourth Edition, 2008. This includes activities of Quality Assurance and Quality Management that determine the quality policy, objectives, and responsibilities, and implements For the purpose of this document, the term “quality standards” shall refer to both Project “process” and “product” quality standards. “Process” quality standards shall cover organizational influences, management support, decision drivers, project management, schedule, resourcing, experience, and others. “Product” quality standards shall cover product content, design, development, deployment, environment, technology,

3.2.1 Definitions

Quality Assurance

“Quality Assurance” means the project is adhering to project management disciplines, planned and performed according to its project plans and that such adherence can be verified by an independent

Quality Management

“Quality Management” is defined as “a subset of project management that includes the process required to assure that the Project shall satisfy the needs for which it was undertaken.” Quality Management consists of activities in quality planning, quality assurance, and quality control

Verification

“Verification” means the project is adhering to project management disciplines, planned and performed according to its project plans and that such adherence can be verified by an independent examination of

Independent

“Independent” means autonomous and impartial verification and validation assessment of a project’s adherence to project management plans and compliance with business requirements. These independent assessments are performed by an entity that is not responsible for developing the product or performing the

3.3 Overview of Contractor Tasks, Deliverables and Processes

The QA Contractor shall perform the following tasks:

1. Develop Quality Assurance Management Plan
2. Conduct Initial Review and Assessment
3. Provide Monthly Reviews and Reports
4. Post implementation Assessment Report

By virtue of the Contractor successfully completing these tasks the Technology Oversight Committee is able to provide oversight to help ensure the City of Portland that the project team and Contractors are applying best practices in project and quality management. This includes the delivery of products that meet business requirements for the project in respect to schedule, cost, scope, functionality, security, and other relevant

3.3.1 Develop Quality Assurance Management Plan

The Contractor is responsible for developing a QA Management Plan for the task order that defines the deliverables, timelines, frequency, and Contractor personnel assigned for the duration of the task order. Following the acceptance of the QA Management Plan by the city the next report will usually be the Initial Assessment Report provided by the Contractor. The Contractor should specify in the QA Management Plan a list of inputs from the City that is needed to perform quality assurance. This would include but is not limited to; all project documentation, formal solicitations (RFP) and contracts as well as access to key staff such as

3.3.2 Initial Review and Assessment

The Contractor is responsible for conducting an initial review of project risks and activities to produce an initial assessment of the project. The initial assessment should include:

- A Risk Management assessment by which the Contractor evaluates the effectiveness of the risk management strategy and planning for the project. This includes specific assessment of the Risk Management metrics and criteria documented in Section 6 of this document.
- A Verification of Project Deliverables by which the Contractor evaluates if deliverables are appropriately scoped and detailed with respect to the current phase, included but not limited to: Project Management Plan, Project Requirement, Project Budget, Project Schedule and Project Communications. This includes specific assessment of the Project Deliverables metrics and criteria documented in Section 6 of
- A Project Management assessment that evaluates the projects organization, roles and responsibilities and management oversight to ensure the project has engaged all stakeholders at the appropriate level and is provided clear authority, managerial support and business ownership. This includes specific assessment of the Project Management metrics and criteria documented in Section 6 of this document.
- A Verification of Product Deliverables by which the Contractor verifies if product deliverables are of acceptable quality and delivered on agreed upon schedule and cost. This includes specific assessment of the Product Deliverables metrics and criteria documented in Section 6 of this document.

3.3.3 Provide Monthly Reviews and Reports

The Contractor shall provide monthly reports to the Technology Oversight Committee. These reports will appraise the current status of the project and track issues, trends and recommendations. The monthly reports shall reflect the current phase of the project and should be tailored to the project respective of risk, The Contractor should include the baseline established in the initial assessment deliverable and track the progress of the metrics at each monthly report. This report shall also include an executive summary of project progress and a forward looking calendar of significant deadlines, decisions and milestones that need Monthly reports shall be delivered to the Technology Oversight Committee following the format established in Section 6 which includes a written report and a presentation of report information. Reports shall be submitted to the City Project Manager, Bureau Director, CTO and CAO 10 business days prior to the monthly meeting to provide review and feedback. The final version shall be provided to the Technology

3.3.4 Post Implementation Assessment Report

Ninety days following the completion of the project the Contractor should provide a post implementation report. This report will assess if the business and technical objectives were achieved based on project scope and acceptance criteria. The Contractor shall validate if prior established project outcome metric and success criteria are being met and as a result the intended value of the project has been realized.

4 Reporting Schedule

Unless specified otherwise in the task order the Contractor will follow a monthly cycle for reporting QA status. Monthly reports shall be delivered to the Technology Oversight Committee following the format established in Section 6 which includes a written report and a presentation of report information. Reports shall be submitted to the City Project Manager, Bureau Director, CTO and CAO 10 business days prior to the monthly meeting to provide review and feedback. The final version shall be provided to the Technology Oversight Committee no less

Week 1-2 Contractor conducts interview, verifies and drafts assessment and reports.

Week 3 - Draft report and presentation distributed for review by City staff.

Week 4 - Contractor delivers report and presentation to the Technology Oversight Committee.

5 Reference Materials

These documents provided accepted best practice and guided the formation of the Quality Assurance Guidelines for the Technology Oversight Committee.

[A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge \(PMBOK Guide\) Fourth Edition, 2008 Project Management Institute. http://www.pmi.org/en/PMBOK-Guide-and-Standards/Standards-Library-of-PMI-Global-](http://www.pmi.org/en/PMBOK-Guide-and-Standards/Standards-Library-of-PMI-Global-Management-Institute)

[1 http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/EISPD/ITIP/IT_Investment_Oversight.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/EISPD/ITIP/IT_Investment_Oversight.shtml)

[2 www.doit.state.nm.us/docs/project_oversight/proj_mgmt_templates/QAIVVGuidelines.doc](http://www.doit.state.nm.us/docs/project_oversight/proj_mgmt_templates/QAIVVGuidelines.doc)

[3 https://www.portlandonline.com/omf/index.cfm?c=44868](https://www.portlandonline.com/omf/index.cfm?c=44868)

6 Initial Review and Monthly Quality Assurance Templates and Metrics

For each assessment area defined in section 3.3.2 Initial Review and Assessment a rating should be provided to describe the Contractors evaluation of that aspect of the project. Reports delivered to the TOC should include both written reports and a formal presentation of findings. Reports should contain but are not limited to the

- Executive Summary of report findings
- Detailed project area assessments using the format provided below.
- A summary of all project assessment areas ratings metrics ratings that have changed since the last
- The status of prior recommendations

As defined in section 3.3.2 Initial Review and Assessment these should include but are not limited to:

- Risk Assessment
- Verification of Project Deliverables
- Project Management Assessment
- Product Deliverables Assessment

Assessment areas shall be evaluated using a series of metrics that contribute to the overall rating for the area.

Rating and Metrics associated with an Assessment area shall be rated using the following Green, Yellow, Red

GREEN - All scope, budget, schedule or quality assurance issues are manageable by the project team and are being resolved in an appropriate timeframe (30 days for short term projects and 60 days for long term projects).

YELLOW - All scope, budget, schedule or quality assurance issues are manageable but one or more require escalation to the projects steering committee for management intervention and resolution following the timeframe for escalated issue resolution (45 days for short term projects and 60 days for long term projects).

RED – Scope, budget, schedule or quality assurance issues have been escalated to project governance but intervention and resolution have not yet occurred resulting in significant risk to scope schedule or budget. Issues at this level are likely to require intervention from Bureau leadership, CTO/CAO or the Technology Oversight

The following worksheets of this workbook contains the Quality Assurance Reporting Template.

Project Title	SAN LCR Project	Reporting Date: 3/23/12
Quality Assurance Executive Summary		
Authored by:		
Overall Rating	<i>Green/Yellow/Red</i>	<i>(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)</i>
Overall Trend	<i>Improving/Deteriorating/Static</i>	<i>No trend data available for this initial report.</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	3.7
Risk Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	2.4
Project Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	3.6
Project Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.0
Product Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.8
Reporting Summary	<p><i>The project is in its Planning/Project Integration Phase. Some initiating documents are available, including the Charter and the Business Case. Some documents are being developed, including a Risk Plan and Register, Communication Plan, and a detailed schedule.</i></p> <p><i>Some documents are not yet started.</i></p> <p><i>Because not all necessary documents are available, some metrics are not yet evaluable. In the case of the Product Deliverables, evaluation will depend largely on Test Plans, and Deployment Plans.</i></p> <p><i>Other metrics also require project plans before they can be effectively evaluated. For instance, evaluating Stakeholder involvement will depend on an approved Communication Plan and detailed project schedule.</i></p>	
Changes since last report	<i>This is the Initial Assessment. No prior report available.</i>	
Current Recommendations	<i>The project should continue with its project initiation activities, including plan development and approval.</i>	
Status of Prior Recommendations	<i>This is the Initial Assessment. No prior report available.</i>	
Individuals Interviewed/Dates	<i>Emily Rice, Project Manager</i> <i>Carolyn Glass, Project Sponsor</i>	
Documents Reviewed/Dates	<p><i>The following documents were reviewed in preparation for this report during the week ending 3/23/12:</i></p> <p><i>Final SAN Charter</i> <i>PM WBS SAN 0316012 (.mpp)</i> <i>SAN Budget 031612</i> <i>TOC SAN LCR 201203 (.ppt)</i> <i>Resource Allocation for SAN Project (tool screenshot)</i> <i>30002469 STRUCTURED Contract</i> <i>CIP ProdSvc SAN Storage</i> <i>Project Communication Plan Template</i> <i>INNOTASIssuesRiskLog_SAN 032012</i></p>	
Meetings Attended/Dates	<p><i>QA Kick-off meeting 3/16/12</i></p> <p><i>Initial Assessment Review 3/23/12</i></p>	

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R	Reporting Date
Description	A Risk Management assessment by which the Contractor evaluates the effectiveness of the risk management strategy and planning for the project.	
Overall Rating	Green/Yellow/Red	Project needs an approved Risk Management Plan by which to assess the risk identification and
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	No trend data available for this initial report.
Overall Score	Calculated	2.4
Reporting Summary	The Charter contains a good initial list of risks for the project.	
Recommendations	The project should adopt a Risk Management Plan. This plan will be the basis by which the project's risk identification and response are evaluated.	

Metric	Green 5 points	Yellow 3 points	Red 1 points	NA 0 points	Score	Trend 	Reporting Summary
R1 - Does a Risk Management Plan exist for the project?	YES	In Progress	NO		2		Need to develop a Risk Management Plan. Risks identified in the Charter.
R2- As risks are encountered are they being confronted in a timely manner to determine a proper response strategy?	YES	Partially	NO		3		Need to develop a Risk Management Plan by which to gauge risk response.
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?	NO	Minor	YES		0		QA needs more information.
R4- Is the project experiencing variances from budget baselines? Are significant cost overruns occurring? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?	NO	Minor	YES		0		QA needs more information.
R5 – Are stakeholders engaged and aligned on project roles, authority and outcomes?	YES	Partially	NO		0		QA needs more information.
R6 – Do business and technology leadership have shared expectations for urgency and priority?	YES	Partially	NO		5		Project is for technical infrastructure upgrade. No changes for Business processes.
R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider's team or approach?	NO	Minor	YES		1		Vendor historically delivers late, with incomplete shipments.
R8- Are the projects human resources appropriately skilled and prepared for the project?	YES	In Progress	NO		2		Project leadership is experienced. Project oversight is engaged. Primary vendor and QA vendor engaged. Project team, roles, and tasks need to be identified in various plans and project schedule.
R9 – Are technology risk being addressed and planned for?	YES	Partially	NO		3		Technical risks are identified in the Charter. Need to develop a Risk Management Plan by which to engage risk response.
R10 – Are factors external to the project negatively influencing the project team's ability to succeed?	NO	Minor	YES		1		Vendor historically delivers late, with incomplete shipments. Vendor identified other factors that may delay

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - PR	Reporting Date
Description	A Verification of Project Deliverables by which the Contractor evaluators if deliverables are appropriately scoped and detailed with respective to the current phase, included but not limited to: Project Management Plan, Change Management, Project Budget, Project Schedule and Project Communications.	
Overall Rating	Green/Yellow/Red	Project needs a detailed schedule, including tasks, dependencires, milestones, and resources. The plan should include the City staff and the vendor.
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	
Overall Score	Calculated	3.6
Reporting Summary	Some are available, but are not yet detailed enough for effective use. Others have not yet been developed.	
Recommendations	Project deliverables should be completed.	

Metric	Green 5 points	Yellow 3 points	Red 1 points	NA 0 points	Score	Trend 	Reporting Summary
PR1 – Does the project have a clearly defined business case with clear objectives and criteria for success and performance metrics?	YES	In Progress	NO		5		CIP ProdSvc SAN Storage document.
PR2- Have all business, functional and technical requirements been clearly documented and prioritized by stakeholders?	YES	In Progress	NO		5		Adequate growth for business use of the SAN is projected in the Business Case.
PR3- Does the project have a realistic timeline based on a work breakdown structure analysis of required activities?	YES	In Progress	NO		0		Cannot be determined. A detailed plan for the city's project team the VAR vendor and Hitachi will provide the basis for assessment.
PR4 – Does the project have a realistic budget? Are adequate financial resources available to accomplish the projects goals?	YES	Partially	NO		3		The budget document show almost all funds expended. Detailed plans from the VAR, Hitachi and the City team will provide the basis for evaluating the budget.
PR5 – Does the project plan contain all tasks required to successfully deliver the project?	YES	Partially	NO		2		The project has a schedule that requires more detail. The project schedule should include detailed tasks, dependencies, milestones, and resource allocations.
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?	YES	Partially	NO		3		Cannot be determined. Contingencies would result from a Risk Management process, to be defined in a Risk Management Plan. A more detailed schedule is necessary for this evaluation.
PR7- Does the project have a formal Change Management Plan? Are changes to scope following these processes?	YES	In Progress	NO		0		QA has not yet asked for a copy of the Change Management Plan.
PR8 – Are communications on the project happening in a timely manner to the right audiences?	YES	Partially	NO		0		The project has not completed a Communication Plan, The Communication Plan is the basis for this evaluation. The project has a template as a basis for the plan.
PR9 – Is the Project Manager actively managing schedule and tasks? Is the project plan up to date and accurately reflect project scope?	YES	Partially	NO		0		Cannot be determined. The project has a schedule that requires more detail. The project schedule should include detailed tasks, dependencies, milestones, and resource allocations.
PR10 – Is the Project Manager taking appropriate action in response to the occurrence issues and risks?	YES	Partially	NO		0		Cannot be determined. A Risk Management Plan (including Issues Management) is the basis for this evaluation.

Assessment Area	Project Management - PM	Reporting Date
Description	The Project Management assessment area evaluates the projects organization, roles and responsibilities and management oversight to ensure the project has engaged all stakeholders at the appropriate level and is provided clear authority, managerial support and business ownership.	
Overall Rating	Green/Yellow/Red	It is early in the project. Some evaluation metrics are "NA" because the plans that will form the basis for evaluation are not yet complete.
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	No trend data available for this initial report.
Overall Score	Calculated	4.0
Reporting Summary	Per this template, the zeroes in the rating reduce the overall Risk score. However, the zeroes indicate 'Not Available.' Removing those 6 factors increase the Risk score to 4. The Charter and Business Case are in place. Remaining plans will be developed and form the basis for evaluating project performance. Among plans to be developed are a Risk and Issues Plan, Communication Plan, Resource Plan, Budget/Cost Management Plan, detailed schedule and schedule management plan.	
Recommendations	Continue to develop project plans, including those listed above.	

Metric	Green 5 points	Yellow 3 points	Red 1 points	NA 0 points	Score	Trend 	Reporting Summary
PM1 – Does the project have an experienced project manager and executive sponsor assigned to the project?	YES	In Progress	NO		0		Initial meeting scheduled for 3/23/12.
PM2-Are all project roles and responsibilities clearly defined and assigned?	YES	Partially	NO		3		The Charter details project leadership and oversight. The Project Management Plan should define other roles.
PM3- Is the City effectively leveraging its contractual authority to resolve issues with vendors and subcontractors?	YES	Partially	NO		0		Cannot yet be determined. A Risk Management Plan, including issues, would include identification, approach, and escalation. That is the basis for evaluation.
PM4 – Are the Project Manager, Sponsor and Steering Committee heeding project warning signs and effectively managing risk?	YES	Partially	NO		0		Cannot yet be determined. Risk and Issues Management Plans would be the basis for this evaluation.
PM5 – Is the project experiencing negative impacts due to unresolved issues?	NO	Minor	YES		0		Cannot yet be determined. Risk and Issues Management Plans would be the basis for this evaluation.
PM6 – Are business units and end users involved and participating as stakeholder in the project outcomes?	YES	Partially	NO		0		Cannot be determined. The Project Management Plan, Resource Management Plan, Communication Plan, and a detailed schedule would be the basis for this evaluation.
PM7 – Is the City properly prepared for the organizational and cultural changes that the project will affect?	YES	Partially	NO		5		This project will not cause organizational or cultural change.
PM8 – Has turnover occurred on key roles such as the PM, Sponsor, Steering Committee or leads? If so, are transitions being managed properly?	NO	Minor	YES		5		No turnover yet identified.
PM9 – Are accepted industry best practices for project management being followed?	YES	Partially	NO		3		Project Business Case and Charter in place. Additional plans need to be developed, including Communication, Risk and Issue Management, Resource Management, and a detailed schedule.
PM10 – Does the project team have confidence that the project goals are obtainable given the project scope, budget and timeline?	YES	Partially	NO		0		Not yet determined.

Assessment Area	Product Deliverables - PD	Reporting Date
Description	A Verification of Product Deliverables by which the Contractor verifies if product deliverables are of acceptable quality and delivered on agreed upon schedule and cost.	
Overall Rating	Green/Yellow/Red	As an initial assessment, there is not enough information available to evaluate the project's products.
Overall Trend	Improving/Deteriorating/Static	No trend data available for this initial report.
Overall Score	Calculated	4.8
Reporting Summary	Assessment for this area is from an interview with the Project Manager and the Project Sponsor.	
Recommendations	The project should develop a Project Management Plan, Test Plan, and Deployment Plan. A detailed schedule will include tasks, dependencies, milestones, and resource allocations. These will be the basis for evaluating when and how project products are to be evaluated.	

Metric	Green 5 points	Yellow 3 points	Red 1 points	NA 0 points	Score	Trend    	Reporting Summary
PD1 - Does the project have clear criteria for testing and acceptance?	YES	In Progress	NO		5		The task orders are detailed and specific.
PD2- Is the vendor performing according to contract terms? Are they responsive to issues?	YES	Partially	NO		5		Deliverables have all been on time and complete.
PD3 - Are the vendor's methodologies and work processes compatible with the City standards and best practices?	YES	Partially	NO		5		The VAR adapts to the City standards. Hitachi has standards that fit well with the City. Weekly face-to-face meetings with the VAR and Hitachi have been productive.
PD4 - Is the vendor showing discipline and diligence to reduce the impacts of change to the project and agreed upon scopes of work?	YES	Partially	NO		5		No changes yet identified.
PD5 - Are the vendors demonstrating best practice quality assurance processes and controls in the development of deliverables?	YES	Partially	NO		5		The City and Hitachi have strong interaction while defining deliverables.
PD6 - Are deliverables being provided that meet the business need and are fit for use?	YES	Partially	NO		5		Deliverable hardware and technical services have been complete and accurate. Documentation has been helpful. This will be a more critical metric when the VAR starts delivering professional services.
PD7 – Are deliverables provided of quality that meets or exceeds City requirements?	YES	Partially	NO		5		Deliverable meet expectations. Hitachi practices and methods are helpful.
PD8 - Is proper training, knowledge transfer and documentation accompanying all vendor deliverables?	YES	In Progress	NO		3		The City purchased training. First sessions start next week. The City has high expectations for this formalized software training for the SAN staff.)
PD9 –Is staff turnover occurring on the vendor's project teams? Are contractual processes being followed for the reassignment of vendor staff to the project? Is proper knowledge transfer occurring?	NO	Minor	YES		5		No turnover yet.
PD10 – Does the project manager have confidence that the vendor is able and committed to deliver the project on schedule with required scope?	YES	Partially	NO		5		The City and the vendors have regular face-to-face meetings. These meetings are building the PM's confidence.