

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
- 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
- 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-](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	Information Technology Advancement Project (ITAP)	Reporting Date: As of Nov. 13, 2012
Quality Assurance Executive Summary		
Authored by:	David Sharon, Principal Quality Assurance Consultant	
Overall Rating	YELLOW	<i>(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)</i>
Overall Trend	Depends on budget approval	<i>(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	4.2
Risk Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	3.7
Project Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.2
Project Management	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	4.7
Product Deliverables	<i>Carried from worksheet</i>	0
Reporting Summary	<p>The announcement of the apparent successful vendor (ASV), Sierra Systems, was made October 15. No protests were submitted. Sierra Systems' proposal and costs are being reviewed by the Project Sponsor and the Commissioner. Sierra Systems' proposal resulted in a cost that was higher than the enabling ordinance. An update to the Business Case is being prepared to explain and justify the increased cost. When the Project Sponsor and Commissioner approve the Business Case, the ASV will be referred to the Chief Procurement Officer for a follow-up report on the enabling ordinance to Council. The follow up report to Council will be in early January 2013 . Barring any major concerns over the follow-up report to Council, the Contract negotiations with the Sierra Systems could begin after the Council update. Explaining and justifying the costs poses a RISK to the project. The ITAP cost/benefits analysis and the RFP evaluation outcome are the essential parts of the updated Business Case. The selected Project Controller candidate (Jean Gargan PMP) started 9/24. The Project Controller has focused on the development of the project r</p>	
Changes since last report	<p>This is the eighth TOC QA report. The apparent successful vendor, Sierra Systems, has been announced and notified. No protests were filed. The schedule for completing the Procurement/Acquisition Phase has significantly changed because cost of the Sierra Systems' proposal (see the Reporting Summary above). The contracted Project Controller started Sept. 24 and has prepared seven draft ITAP project management deliverables. They are: 1) The contract readiness mpp, 2) an updated Project Charter, 3) the Project Management Plan, 4) the Change Management Plan, 5) the Communications Plan, 6) the Issues Management Plan, and 7) the Risk Management Plan. This project documentation will be used during contract negotiations with Sierra Systems.</p>	
Current Recommendations	<p>1. Finalize the project management readiness documents for the contract negotiation and implementation phase, 2. complete the contract negotiation planning, 3. complete the evaluation of the top scoring vendor's proposal, prepare the financial analysis and cost/benefits analysis, and update the Business Case, 4) emphasize benefits for both the customer and BDS (tangible & intangible, objective and subjective, and empirical).</p>	
Status of Prior Recommendations	<p>Completed the drafts of the Project Management documentation for the contract negotiations and implementation phase. These documents were reviewed by CAI, the PMO and the ITAP Team. The acquisition/procurement schedule has been updated to reflect the changes noted in the Sections above.</p>	
Individuals Interviewed/Dates	<p>Ross Caron with numerous emails and phone conversations about the Business Case update.</p>	

Documents Reviewed/Dates	The ITAP PM Status Report for the TOC meeting on November 9, 2012, the major issues resulting from the Business Process Mapping and there status as of November 6. Two versions of the updated Business Case on 10/26 and 11/6/2012.
Meetings Attended/Dates	Ross Caron and Jean Gargan on Monday, October 8, 2012.

Assessment Area	Risk Management - R	Reporting Date - November 13, 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	Yellow	(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)
Overall Trend	Dependent on Budget Approval	(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)
Overall Score	Calculated	3.7
Reporting Summary	<p>Since the cost of the project is higher than original enabling ordinance, the ITAP Team has met with the Project Sponsor and Commissioner Saltzman to evaluate the top vendor's proposal, to develop the financial analysis based on the new project costs, and to update the Business Case. After receiving approval from the Project Sponsor and the Commissioner, the City's Chief Procurement Officer will provide an update to the City Council on the updated Business Case. This situation is the major RISK to the project (see the Executive Summary - Reporting Summary). The ITAP Team is doing the right things to ensure that 1) the selected vendor best meets the City's requirements and 2) the final pricing by the top scoring vendor is appropriately reviewed and approved. The ITAP Team has started the negotiation preparation process with CASE Associates Inc. The Project Controller, Jean Gargan, started Sept. 24. The Project Controller has prepared the project documentation for the contract negotiations with the selected vendor. The project documentation was reviewed by CAI, the PMO and the ITAP Team.</p>	
Recommendations	<p>1. Finalize the project management readiness documents for the contract negotiation and implementation phase, 2. prepare a comprehensive cost/benefits analysis that explains and justifies the project costs and 3. Receive approval for the project costs and the updated Business Case.</p>	

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 Risk Management Plan has been prepared by the Project Controller. the Risk Log is updated monthly with risk rankings based on the impact to the project and probability of occurring,
R2- As risks are encountered are they being confronted in a timely manner to determine a proper response strategy?					3	↑	The Risk caused by the ASV's project costs being higher than the enabling ordinance was not identified until after the BAFO.
R3- Is the project experiencing variances from schedule baselines? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?		YES			3	↑	Project rebaselined when the RFP was started. The plan was to have the contract in place by Oct. 1, 2012. Contract negotiation will now tentatively start in December pending the approval of the updated Business Case and Sierra System's proposal.
R4- Is the project experiencing variances from budget baselines? Are significant cost overruns occurring? Have significant milestones been missed? If so how frequently?		Project costs per the BAFO need approval			2	↑	The cost for the Implementation Phase is higher than the costs presented in the enabling ordinance. See the Reporting Summary above for a description of the evaluation process of the top vendor's proposal and updating the Business Case.
R5 – Are stakeholders engaged and aligned on project roles, authority and outcomes?	YES				5	⇔	YES
R6 – Do business and technology leadership have shared expectations for urgency and priority?	Issues exists				4	↑	Business Process Mapping has been completed. The to-be model will be compared to the COTS workflow. Major issues have been 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. These issues are expected to be resolved by Nov. 30
R7 – Are there risks with the solution provider's team or approach?					1	↑	Proposed vendor costs are higher than the costs presented in the enabling ordinance.
R8- Are the projects human resources appropriately skilled and prepared for the project?	Project Control-let on board				5	↑	The PM resource to prepare the planning readiness documentation and later maintain the plans and to create and maintain the project schedule is now on board and has prepared the baseline project documentation.
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?	Maybe				4	⇔	Some possibility when the New City Council meets to review the ITAP Business Case.



Assessment Area	Project Deliverables - ITAP	Reporting Date: November 13, 2012
Description	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, 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	4.2
Reporting Summary	The preparation of the draft Project documentation for the contract negotiations and implementation phase was completed by the Project Controller. CASE Associates prepared a negotiation preparation checklist for the ITAP Team. The ITAP Team is preparing an updated Business Case because of the ASV's proposed project costs.	
Recommendations	1. Update the ITAP Business Case and get the approval of the Project Sponsor and the Commissioner. 2. Revise the Project Management Plan, Communications Plan, Change Management Plan and Issue/Risk Management Plan based on feedback from CAI, the PMO and the ITAP Team.	

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?		Update In Progress			3	↑	The Business Case is being updated - See the Executive Summary and Risk Management assessment templates.
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. The master schedule will be developed after the vendor is selected.
PR4 – Does the project have a realistic budget? Are adequate financial resources available to accomplish the projects goals?		Project costs need approval			2	↑	YES for the Procurement/Acquisition and Readiness Phase. As a result of the BAFO, the new, revised project costs need approval (see R4).
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?	YES				5	↔	A Change Management Plan has been prepared by the Project Controller.
PR8 – Are communications on the project happening in a timely manner to the right audiences?	YES				5	↔	YES per the Communications 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

Assessment Area	Project Management - ITAP	Reporting Date: November 13, 2012
Description	<i>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.</i>	
Overall Rating	Green	<i>(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)</i>
Overall Trend	<i>Improving based on project cost approval</i>	<i>(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	4.7
Reporting Summary	<i>Project Management has been effective during the Procurement/Acquisition Phase. Increased emphasis is being put on preparing for contract negotiations and project readiness for the Implementation Phase. the ITAP Team has been updating the Business Case to explain and justify the ASV's project costs. CASE Associates prepared recommendations for the negotiation team roles and responsibilities and for preparing the negotiation strategy. A Project Controller, Jean Gargan, PMP, was selected and started Sept. 24.</i>	
Recommendations	<i>1. Complete the Business Case that explains and justifies the ASV's project costs. 2. Finalize the Contract Negotiation Planning and Project Management readiness planning and documentation for the contract negotiation and Implementation.</i>	

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/Acquisition 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 - 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?		Possible			3	↑	The updated Business Case needs to be approved for the project to continue (see the Executive Summary). The major issues identified during the Business Process mapping activity are documented and being resolved. The goal is to have all issues resolved by November 30.
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?	No				5	↔	The ITAP has been stable.

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				4	↑	YES - the ITAP Team is confident that the Project Sponsor and Commissioner will approve the project costs and the updated Business case,

Assessment Area	Product Deliverables - ITAP	Reporting Date: November 13, 2012
Description	<i>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.</i>	
Overall Rating	<i>Not Applicable at this time</i>	<i>(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)</i>
Overall Trend	<i>STATIC</i>	<i>(Contractor subjective assessment for the reporting period)</i>
Overall Score	<i>Calculated</i>	0
Reporting Summary	<i>This matrix does not apply. The vendor has been selected but contract negotiations have not started.</i>	
Recommendations	<i>NONE - NA</i>	

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		