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 Planning[1] and State of New Mexico Department of Information Technology[2] as well as other examples of QA services on projects within the city like the Public Safety Systems Revitalization Program[3]. 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 Contactor. 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
- A Verification of Project Deliverables by which the Contractor evaluates if deliverables are appropriately scoped and detailed with respective 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
- 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

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-

1 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
3 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	Information Technology Advancement Project (ITAP)	Reporting Date: As of August 28, 2012
Quality Assurance Executive Summary		
Authored by:	David Sharon, Principal Quality Assurane Consultant	
Overall Rating	**GREEN**	*(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)*
Overall Trend	Good and Improving	*(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**4.722222222**
Risk Management	*Carried from worksheet*	4.666666667
Project Deliverables	*Carried from worksheet*	4.5
Project Management	*Carried from worksheet*	5
Product Deliverables	*Carried from worksheet*	0
Reporting Summary	The ITAP is in the final stages of Procurement, Acquistion and Readiness Phase (pre implementation). The level 2 evaluation was completed in April with Accela, CSDC, and Sierra Systems moving on to level 3. Site visits were conducted for each of the three vendors in July and August 2012. All three vendors moved on to Level 4 - BAFO (Best and Final Offer) Phase. The Final scoring and announcement of the ASV (apparent successful vendor) is expected by mid-September. A Task Order was written for hiring a Project Controller to develop the project management and planning documentation. The reviewing of resumes of potential candidates has begun. The Project Controller will first focus on the development of the project documentation for the contract negotiations with the selected vendor (i.e. the Project Management Plan and Communications Plan). With contract negotiations not expected to start until October, the candidate will be selected in early September so the project documentation can be ready when negotiation begin in October.	

Changes since last report	This is the sixth TOC QA report. The ITAP Team has focused on conducting the site visits and scoring the proposals. Because the site visits occurred in July and August, the schedule for completing the scoring, announcing the apparent successful vendor, and starting contract negotiations has been moved 1+ month. The plan now is to have the three finalists submit their best and final offer (BAFO) by September 11. The RFP Scoring Committee is scheduled to make their final scoring of the RFP proposals by mid-September. The City's Chief Procurement Officer is then required to provide an update to the City Council on the outcome of the scoring. The contract negotiations can then begin in October. This schedule change is not a risk. The ITAP Team has done the the right things to ensure that 1) the selected vendor best meets the City's requirements and 2) the selection process minimizes the chances of a vendor protest that could delay start of contract negotiations. The ITAP Team has started the negotiation preparation and planning process with CASE Associates Inc.
Current Recommendations	1. Develop the project management readiness documents for the contract negotiation and implemetation phase, 2. Hire or contract with someone to be responsible for developing and maintaining the Project Management Planning documentation and the Microsoft Project Plan and 3. complete the contract negotiation planning.
Status of Prior Recommendations	Completing the prepararion of the Project Management documentation for the contract negotiations and implementation phase is targeted for the end of September. A Project Controller Resource Task Order has been prepared and approved. The candidate interview and selection process has begun. The goal is to select a Project Controller by September 7. The acquistion/procurement schedule has been updated to reflect the changes noted in the Section above.
Individuals Interviewed/Dates	Richard Appleyard, Ross Caron and Kimberly Tallant on Thursday, August 23, 2012.
Documents Reviewed/Dates	The ITAP PM Status Report for the TOC meeting on September 4, 2012, the ITAP Risk Log as of August 23, the 10 major issues resulting from the Business Process Mapping dated August 20, 2012, and 3 resumes of Project Controller candidates.
Meetings Attended/Dates	Richard Appleyard, Ross Caron and Kimberly Tallant on Thursday, August 23, 2012.

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R	Reporting Date - August 28, 2012
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***	*(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)*
Overall Trend	*Improving*	*(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**4.666666667**
Reporting Summary	*The ITAP Team has focused on conducting the site visits and scoring the proposals. Because the site visits occurred in July and August, the schedule for completing the scoring, announcing the apparent successful vendor, and starting contract negotiations has been moved 1+ month. The plan now is to have the three finalists submit their best and final offer (BAFO) by September 11. The RFP Scoring Committee is scheduled to make their final scoring of the RFP proposals by mid-September. The City's Chief Procurement Officer is then required to provide an update to the City Council on the outcome of the scoring. The contract negotiations can then begin in October. This schedule change is not a risk. The ITAP Team is doing the the right things to ensure that 1) the selected vendor best meets the City's requirements and 2) the selection process minimizes the chances of a vendor protest that could delay start of contract negotiations. The ITAP Team has started the negotiation preparation process with CASE Associates Inc. The Scope of Work has been written for hiring a Project Controller to develop the project management and planning documentation. The Project Controller will first focus on the project a*	
Recommendations	*1. Develop the project management readiness documents for the contract negotiation and implemetation phase and 2. Hire or contract with someone to be responsible for developing and maintaining the Project Management Planning documentation and the Microsoft Project Plan.*	

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?					5	⇔	**A draft Risk Management Plan has been prepared. the Risk Log is updated monthly**
R2- As risks are encountered are they being confronted in a timely manner to determine a proper response strategy?					5	⇔	**As risks are encountered they are logged and discussed with the Project Team.**
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?	**YES**				***4***	⇧	**Project rebaselined when the RFP was started. The plan was to have the contract in place by Oct. 1, 2012. Contract negotiation will now start in October. The Level 3 and Level 4 evaluation schedules have moved a month in order to conduct the site visits, have the finalist submit their best and final offers, and announce the ASV.**
R4- Is the project experiencing variances from budget baselines? Are significant cost overruns occurring? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?					5	⇔	**There has been some variance because the RFP release date was changed from Dec. 2011 to Feb. 2012. However, the Milestone Based Budget Performance is less than 1.0.**
R5 – Are stakeholders engaged and aligned on project roles, authority and outcomes?	**YES**				5	⇔	**YES defined in the Project Charter. Users and stakeholders are involved in Process Mapping part of the BPRP. However, possible resistance issues may result.**
R6 – Do business and technology leadership have shared expectations for urgency and priority?	**Issues exists**				4	⇧	**Business Process Mapping is underway. The to-be model will be compared to the COTS workflow. Major issues are being documented. The expectation is to have these issues resolved prior to the start of the Implementation Phase. These issues affect how the City's business processes are defined in the vendor's product.**
R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider's team or approach?				**NA**	0		**NA. TBD when the vendor is selected.**

The RFP Scoring Committee

R8- Are the projects human resources appropriately skilled and prepared for the project?		**PM search has begun**			**4**	⇧	**The project needs a PM resource to prepare the planning readiness documentation and later maintain the plans and to create and maintain the project schedule. This resource needs to be on board in September in order to have the project documentation ready when negotiations begin.**
R9 – Are technology risk being addressed and planned for?	**YES**				**5**	⇔	**YES - in the RFP, proposal evaluation and scoring, and contract negotiations.**
R10 – Are factors external to the project negatively influencing the project team's ability to succeed?	**NO**				**5**	⇔	**None at this time. Some possibility in July 2013 when the New City Council meets.**

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - ITAP	Reporting Date: August 28, 2012
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***	*(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)*
Overall Trend	*Improving*	*(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**4.5**
Reporting Summary	*The prepararion of the Project documentation for the contract negotiations and implementation phase is targeted for the end of September. A Project Controller Resource Scope of Work has been approved. This resource will prepare and maintain the project management documentation (See R8). The candidate evaluation and selection process is underway. CASE Associates prepared a negotiation preparation checklist for the ITAP Team.*	
Recommendations	*The first priority is the development of the Project Management Plan, Communications Plan, Change Management Plan and Issue/Risk Management Plan followed by preparation of the City's ITAP negotiation strategy.*	

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			5	⇔	**YES - in the Project Charter**
PR2- Have all business, functional and technical requirements been clearly documented and prioritized by stakeholders?	YES	In Progress			5	⇔	**YES - in the RFP**

PR3- Does the project have a realistic timeline based on a work breakdown structure analysis of required activities?	**YES**	**In Progress**			**5**	⇔	**YES for the Procurement/Acquisition and Readiness Phase**
PR4 – Does the project have a realistic budget? Are adequate financial resources available to accomplish the projects goals?	**YES**	**Partially**			**5**	⇔	**YES for the Procurement/Acquisition and Readiness Phase. The master schedule will be developed after the vendor is selected.**
PR5 – Does the project plan contain all tasks required to successfully deliver the project?		**Partially**			**3**	⇔	**YES for the Procurement/Acquisition and Readiness Phase. ITAP has a high-level Plan. More detail will be needed after the vendor is selected to create a Master Project Plan and finalize the Project Management Plan.**
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?	**YES**				**4**	⇧	**The schedule and budget plan are reasonable for a project this size. The schedule for the Acquisition/Procurement Phase has been updated. A Contingency Plan is being prepared in case the negotiations with the ASV fail.**
PR7- Does the project have a formal Change Management Plan? Are changes to scope following these processes?		**In Progress**			**3**	⇧	**This currently is part of the Communication and Outreach Plan. A formal chapter in the Project Management Plan is needed along with the Change Management Plan and the formation of a Change Control Board.**
PR8 – Are communications on the project happening in a timely manner to the right audiences?	**YES**				**5**	⇔	**YES per the Communications and Outreach Plan**
PR9 – Is the Project Manager actively managing schedule and tasks? Is the project plan up to date and accurately reflect project scope?	**YES**				**5**	⇔	**YES**
PR10 – Is the Project Manager taking appropriate action in response to the occurrence issues and risks?	**YES**				**5**	⇔	**YES for now. A draft Issue and Risk Management Plan has been developed (See R1) and the Risk Log is updated monthly.**

Assessment Area	Project Management - ITAP	Reporting Date: August 28, 2012
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***	*(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)*
Overall Trend	*Improving*	*(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**5**
Reporting Summary	*Project Management has been effective during the Procurement/Acquistion Phase. Increased emphasis is being put on preparing for contract negotiations and project readiness for the Implementation Phase. CASE Associates prepared recommendations for the negotiation team roles and responsibilities and for preparing the negotiation strategy. A Project Controller Resource Scope of Work has been prepared and approved. The candidate evaluation and selection process is underway.*	
Recommendations	*1. Complete the Contract Negotiation Planning and Project Management readiness planning and documentation for the contract negotiation and Implementation Phase. 2. Select a Project Controller by September 7.*	

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**				**5**	⇔	**YES**
PM2-Are all project roles and responsibilities clearly defined and assigned?	**YES**				**5**	⇔	**YES for the Procurement/Acqusition and Readiness Phase. Assignments will be updated based on the Master Project Plan and the Project Management Plan.**

PM3- Is the City effectively leveraging its contractual authority to resolve issues with vendors and subcontractors?	**YES**				**5**	⇔	**YES**
PM4 – Are the Project Manager, Sponsor and Steering Committee heeding project warning signs and effectively managing risk?	**YES**				**5**	⇔	**YES so far but will become more intensive after the vendor is selected. A draft Issue and Risk Management Plan has been prepared and a Risk Log is updated monthly.**
PM5 – Is the project experiencing negative impacts due to unresolved issues?	**YES**				**5**	⇔	**No unresolved issues at this time**
PM6 – Are business units and end users involved and participating as stakeholder in the project outcomes?	**YES**				**5**	⇔	**YES per the Business Process Review Plan and the Communications and Outreach Plan.**
PM7 – Is the City properly prepared for the organizational and cultural changes that the project will affect?	**YES**	**In Progress**			**5**	⇔	**YES per the Business Process Review Plan and the Communications and Outreach Plan.**
PM8 – Has turnover occurred on key roles such as the PM, Sponsor, Steering Committee or leads? If so, are transitions being managed properly?	**YES**	**Minor**			**5**	⇔	**Ross Caron replaced Hank McDonald. QA is monitoring the transition.**
PM9 – Are accepted industry best practices for project management being followed?	**YES**				**5**	⇔	**QA will ensure best practices are being followed**
PM10 – Does the project team have confidence that the project goals are obtainable given the project scope, budget and timeline?	**YES**				**5**	⇔	**YES**

Assessment Area	Product Deliverables - ITAP	Reporting Date: July 31, 2012
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	*Not Applicable at this time*	*(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)*
Overall Trend	*STATIC*	*(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**0**
Reporting Summary	*This matrix does not apply. The vendor has NOT been selected.*	
Recommendations	*NONE - NA*	

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?				**NA**	**0**		
PD2- Is the vendor performing according to contract terms? Are they responsive to issues?				**NA**	**0**		
PD3 - Are the vendor's methodologies and work processes compatible with the City standards and best practices?				**NA**	**0**		
PD4 - Is the vendor showing discipline and diligence to reduce the impacts of change to the project and agreed upon scopes of work?				**NA**	**0**		

PD5 - Are the vendors demonstrating best practice quality assurance processes and controls in the development of deliverables?				**NA**	**0**		
PD6 - Are deliverables being provided that meet the business need and are fit for use?				**NA**	**0**		
PD7 – Are deliverables provided of quality that meets or exceeds City requirements?				**NA**	**0**		
PD8 - Is proper training, knowledge transfer and documentation accompanying all vendor deliverables?				**NA**	**0**		
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?				**NA**	**0**		
PD10 – Does the project manager have confidence that the vendor is able and committed to deliver the project on schedule with required scope?				**NA**	**0**		