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

NA - Not Applicable. If a metric is not applicable to a project or not applicable at this time to a project the NA item should be used along with a point value of zero. In this manner items that are not applicable to a project will not impact the assessment. If an item is not applicable at this phase of the project but will be in the future it should be noted along with when the metric will be applicable in the Reporting Summary field for that metric. If the deliverable referenced by a metric is applicable and overdue it is up to the QA to determine the

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

Project Title	Portland Housing Bureau HDS Implementation	Reporting Date: August 2012
Quality Assurance Executive Summary		
Authored by:	*Edward L Bye*	
Overall Rating	**Green**	*Meets Expectations*
Overall Trend	*Improved over the last period*	*The Data Clean-up effort has been resolved with the approach document and approved by the management team.*
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**4.5**
Risk Management	*Carried from worksheet*	4.1
Project Deliverables	*Carried from worksheet*	4.8
Project Management	*Carried from worksheet*	4.7
Product Deliverables	*Carried from worksheet*	4.3
Reporting Summary	*Management has approved the approach for the Data Clean-up effort and based upon the approach the project schedule and the Data Conversion effort will not be impacted.* *Currently HDS is reviewing the requirements for changes to the AP Interface. The modifications will impact the budget, but there are no indications at this time that it will have an impact on the project schedule.*	
Changes since last report	*Data Clean approach identified and approved*	
Current Recommendations		
Status of Prior Recommendations	*The Project Team updated the HDS Data Conversion Plan with the required PHB approach for their part of the clean up and the level of effort.*	
Individuals Interviewed/Dates	*Meeting held Kathy Steen Wednesday August 22nd and a second meeting with Jacob Fox later that same day .*	
Documents Reviewed/Dates	*HDS/PHB (PDF) Project Plan, HDS Status Report, Technical Issues Log and the PHB Monthly Project Progress Report and the HDS Data Conversion Plan*	
Meetings Attended/Dates		

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R	Reporting Date -August 2012
Description	*As a caution, metric R4 has been put into a yellow status until the decsion has be made on the approach and effort required for the Multi-Family data cleanup.*	
Overall Rating	*Green*	
Overall Trend	*Improved*	
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**4.1**
Reporting Summary	*The open item at this time is the level of effort required by the vendor for modifications to the AP Interface.*	
Recommendations		

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				5	⇧	Most of the risk were associated with the first phase of the project. There no identified risk for the remainder of the project
R2- As risks are encountered are they being confronted in a timely manner to determine a proper response strategy?	YES				4		
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?	YES						
R4- Is the project experiencing variances from budget baselines? Are significant cost overruns occurring? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?	NO				4	⇧	The only major variance in the budget at this time is the AP Interface. Management team is working with the vendor on the required changes. However, at this time it is not believed these changes will have an impact on the schedule.
R5 – Are stakeholders engaged and aligned on project roles, authority and outcomes?	YES				5		
R6 – Do business and technology leadership have shared expectations for urgency and priority?	YES				5		
R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider's team or approach?	YES				4		
R8- Are the projects human resources appropriately skilled and prepared for the project?	YES				5		
R9 – Are technology risk being addressed and planned for?	YES				5		
R10 – Are factors external to the project negatively influencing the project team's ability to succeed?	NO				4		

Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - PR	Reporting Date -August 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*	
Overall Trend	*Improved*	
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**4.8**
Reporting Summary	*The Data clean-up effort has been resolved, documented for review and approved by the management team. Based upon the approach for the clean-up effort there will be no negative impact on the schedule.*	
Recommendations		

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				5		
PR2- Have all business, functional and technical requirements been clearly documented and prioritized by stakeholders?	YES				5		
PR3- Does the project have a realistic timeline based on a work breakdown structure analysis of required activities?	YES				5		
PR4 – Does the project have a realistic budget? Are adequate financial resources available to accomplish the projects goals?	YES				5		
PR5 – Does the project plan contain all tasks required to successfully deliver the project?	YES				4	⇧	The Data clean-up effort will not have an impact on either the project schedule or the Data Conversion effort required by the vendor.
PR6 – Are estimates of schedule and cost realistic and include contingency to mitigate disruption?	YES				4		
PR7- Does the project have a formal Change Management Plan? Are changes to scope following these processes?	YES				5		
PR8 – Are communications on the project happening in a timely manner to the right audiences?	YES				5		
PR9 – Is the Project Manager actively managing schedule and tasks? Is the project plan up to date and accurately reflect project scope?	YES				5		
PR10 – Is the Project Manager taking appropriate action in response to the occurrence issues and risks?	YES				5		

Assessment Area	Project Management - PM	Reporting Date - August 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*	*Meets most key Metrics for the period*
Overall Trend	*Improved*	
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**4.7**
Reporting Summary	*Data Clean-up efforts has been resolved and the approach has been approved by the management team.*	
Recommendations		

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		
PM2-Are all project roles and responsibilities clearly defined and assigned?	YES				5		
PM3- Is the City effectively leveraging its contractual authority to resolve issues with vendors and subcontractors?	YES				4		
PM4 – Are the Project Manager, Sponsor and Steering Committee heeding project warning signs and effectively managing risk?	YES				5	⇧	The Management team contiunes to take a proactive approach on resolving issues.
PM5 – Is the project experiencing negative impacts due to unresolved issues?	No				4	⇧	Data Clean up effort has been unresolved and the approach has been document and reviewed by management.
PM6 – Are business units and end users involved and participating as stakeholder in the project outcomes?	YES				5		
PM7 – Is the City properly prepared for the organizational and cultural changes that the project will affect?	YES				5		
PM8 – Has turnover occurred on key roles such as the PM, Sponsor, Steering Committee or leads? If so, are transitions being managed properly?	YES				4		
PM9 – Are accepted industry best practices for project management being followed?	YES				5		
PM10 – Does the project team have confidence that the project goals are obtainable given the project scope, budget and timeline?	YES				5		

Assessment Area	Product Deliverables - PD	Reporting Date-August 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	*Green*	
Overall Trend	*Improved*	
Overall Score	*Calculated*	**4.3**
Reporting Summary	*Most of the Metrics for the reporting period meet or exceed expectations.*	
Recommendations		

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				4		
PD2- Is the vendor performing according to contract terms? Are they responsive to issues?	Yes				4		
PD3 - Are the vendor's methodologies and work processes compatible with the City standards and best practices?	Yes				4		
PD4 - Is the vendor showing discipline and diligence to reduce the impacts of change to the project and agreed upon scopes of work?	Yes				5		
PD5 - Are the vendors demonstrating best practice quality assurance processes and controls in the development of deliverables?	Yes				4		
PD6 - Are deliverables being provided that meet the business need and are fit for use?	Yes				5		
PD7 – Are deliverables provided of quality that meets or exceeds City requirements?	Yes				4		
PD8 - Is proper training, knowledge transfer and documentation accompanying all vendor deliverables?	Yes				4		
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?	Yes				4		
PD10 – Does the project manager have confidence that the vendor is able and committed to deliver the project on schedule with required scope?	Yes				5		