

Project Closure Review

Project Title: Defining and Delivering a Service Level Agreement (DDSLA)

Project Manager: Ann Berry-Kline

Client: Larry Merkley

Sponsor: Janine Roeth,
Co-Sponsors: Bill Hyder, and Mark Cianca

Closure Criteria:

- Does the client, sponsor or customer agree this project can be closed at this time?
Yes; pending remaining deliverables
- Is this project being closed because it was completed or for other reasons such as changing priorities, funding, organizational changes, incorporation into other efforts, changing client needs or resource constraints?
Project change forms were completed for projects and work packages of the program that slipped. Remaining work has been handed off and is documented in the deliverable review.

Goal Review:

There were 3 goals for DDSLA:

1. The definition and agreement of initial global SLAs and outline for local service level agreements.
 2. The definition and implementation of initial OLAs
 3. Recommendations for ongoing maintenance
- Was the goal met? Did this project offer real solutions to the type of problem or opportunity addressed?
All the goals were met. Some of the goals have remaining work as outlined in the deliverable review.
 - Was it partially met? What were the contributing factors to accomplishing this goal?
Several deliverables were not fully completed. Project change control forms were completed to document the changes in scope and timeline.
 - What were the constraining factors in accomplishing the goal?
Processes created but not implemented, lack of service definition, lack of unwillingness to align to the definition of a service or process.

Deliverables Review:

Deliverables for DDSLA included

SLA template – Completed

SLA Summary of Finding - Completed

OLA template – Completed

OLA Summary of Findings – Completed

Internal Service Catalog – Completed; but not fully implemented (for ITS Staff to see) or utilized (service info linked in)

Metrics/SLA folders – Completed

ITS and Campus SLA – Completed

ITS and Campus OLA – In-progress; will also enumerate where we are not in alignment to the SLA

CruzMail OLA, SLA, updated service page, metrics report, linked to SLA page – Completed

CruzNet OLA, SLA, updated service page, linked to SLA page – Completed – noted gaps in service that must be addressed

Standard Desktop Support OLA, SLA, and updated service page are nearing review. Service definition gaps include: no patch process developed yet, metrics are being worked on but may not be ready for initial SLA.

CruzTime OLA, SLA, updated service page – Change control form #3 – Moved to IT Services.

Local SLAs, updated TSAs or service catalogs for each division, linked from the ITS Service Catalog – UNIX local SLA will not be completed as part of the DDSLA Program and is documented in Project Change Control Form #2. BAS, Library, Student Affairs, and Social Sciences have not completed their local SLAs yet. Change control form #3 documents that Bill Hyder will manage this work to completion.

Next Services Recommendation – Completed

Transition of completed work to IT Services –Completed

Program Recap, Lessons Learned and Recommendations – Completed

- Were the deliverables fully or partially accomplished? If partial, what are the reasons, issues or concerns regarding that deliverable?
- Are there deliverables that were not accomplished? What are the contributing factors?

Project Closure Review

- Did deliverables change during the implementation? Were there additional deliverables or re-scoping of deliverables?

Success Criteria Review:

The Success Criteria for the DDSLA Program were:

Agreed upon global SLAs between ITS and Deans/Principal Officers
This criterion was met.

ITS' ability to understand client impacts and responsively deliver services within ITS defined capacity within focus.

In hindsight, this criterion is not appropriately scoped to the goals and deliverables of the DDSLA Program. This criterion was minimally met for the highlighted services by implementing the standard change and incident management and major incident handling processes. Standardizing the change management process for all of ITS exceeded the expectations in meeting this criterion. The ITS and Campus SLA is a good starting point to set expectations with clients however alignment is necessary within ITS to comply.

ITS is able to monitor and report on service delivery performance including variances

The criterion was met given what is currently in place. More could be done here with an over arching metrics program.

ITS' ability to inform continuous service delivery and campus growth needs through SLA performance on focused services and processes.

This criterion was not met. The SLA performance process is not mature enough to inform ITS about continuous service delivery and campus growth needs.

ITS and campus leaders meet and communicate about services provided using SLA and related materials.

This criterion was met.

- Were the operational results achieved? Did the project provide the planned improvements for the client?
- Were additional results achieved besides the original success criteria? Were there unforeseen benefits to this project?
- Were all the business or operational improvements identified or are there other measures of success that could have been part of this project?

Implementation Methods Review:

See the DDSLA – Program Recap, Lessons Learned and Recommendations document

- What worked and what did not work during the implementation? What did the project manager learn regarding the implementation process? What did the organization learn during the implementation?
- What tools were used? What tools would you recommend for the future?

Resource Review:

- Was this project implemented according to schedule? Explain any event(s) requiring major schedule changes.
Early in the program, the estimated and actual schedules were in close alignment. After the templates were created and the work was spread out to the various groups the estimated and actual schedule dates began to differ. When starting on the highlighted services, a strategy was decided upon by the DDSLA Program team to step the 4 services rather than do them concurrently. This added time to the schedule. Work for CruzMail stabilization took priority. Given similar staff working on both CruzMail and CruzTime, this naturally put the completion of the CruzTime OLA and SLA at a lower priority. Another deviation from schedule happened and still is happening in getting the local SLAs from the DLs completed. Many of the DLs prioritized this work differently than requested and scheduled by the program manager. Four of ten local SLAs are outstanding; one was moved out of the program; 4 completed.
- What was the budget performance for this project? What were the major events impacting the budget?
This was a net zero project. No budget other than staff resources was allocated for this program. A small amount of money was spent to hire a consultant to complete the rendering of the Internal Service Catalog.
- Were resources utilized according to plan or were there changes impacting resource utilization?
The OLA/SLA process took longer than expected due to time needed to document the features and functions of the service, implement incident, major incident and change management processes. Extra time was needed to align staff to these processes and create templates, procedures or data flows to support the processes.

Recommendations and Implications:

- What do you recommend for the future? Is this project just a step along the way? Is there another level of implementation that could be accomplished? Could this project be applied to other organizations?
Per the DDSLA Charter "will implement a basic SLA structure in the April to June timeframe. The basic SLA structure will consist of the SLAs, Service Catalog, OLAs, existing ITIL and PM processes and limited metrics... Additional and ongoing improvements will be necessary to mature and fill in the SLA framework." These are documented in the DDSLA

Project Closure Review

Lessons Learned and Recommendations document.

- Did other problems surface during this implementation that needed to be addressed?
- Are there any improvements you would recommend regarding the project implementation process or the tools provided?

Reviewers: (Project Manager, Sponsor, Client/Customer)

Project Manager: Ann Berry-Kline

Date: 09/27/07

Project Sponsor: Janine Roeth, Bill Hyder and Mark Cianca

Date:

Client/Customer: Larry Merkley

Date: