

Draft assessment:

1. Charter alignment:

1a. Quality vs. Charter & Timeline

Project outputs generally match the objectives stated in the Charter. Core features appear in progress, but several items in the Gantt chart are behind schedule, suggesting moderate timeline risk.

1b. Video vs. Objectives

The video aligns with the Charter's goals and describes the intended system clearly. Some features shown in the video appear incomplete or not yet implemented in the current state of the project.

1c. Milestone Review Accuracy

Milestone documentation identifies progress, risks, and issues, but some risks appear understated relative to actual delays. Overall, the milestone review partially reflects reality but lacks depth in describing process gaps.

2. Quality in General

2a. Tracking of Changes, Issues, Risks, Decisions

Tracking exists but is inconsistent. Certain changes and emerging issues are recorded late or with limited detail, reducing the usefulness of the logs.

2b. Accuracy of Tracking vs. Actual Risks

Recorded risks do not fully match the project's observable delays and workload pressures. Some significant timeline risks are not clearly identified or updated.

2c. Quality Tracking vs. Metrics

Quality checks are present but not tied closely to predefined metrics. Verification steps appear informal, making it difficult to measure adherence to planned quality standards.

Audit questions:

1. Which Proj Charter objectives are at risk, and what's being done to address them?
2. How are we defining when a risk or issue should be escalated in the issue logs?
3. Are there quality metrics you planned but not yet implemented? If yes - why?
4. How closely is your team using the Gantt chart for weekly planning?
5. Can you clarify any discrepancies between the video features and the current implementation?
6. How do you decide when a change request is needed rather than an informal adjustment?
7. What internal process challenges have affected your ability to meet timeline milestones?