

# CEB Project Startup Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

**Project Name:** Central Electronics Bank Replacement (CEB) Project

**Agency:** North Dakota Department of Emergency Services

**Business Unit/Program Area:** State Radio

**Project Sponsor:** Mike Lynk

**Project Manager:** Aaron Kielhack

### Project Description

The State Radio Communications System has over 4000 users representing 238 local, state and federal government agencies. The central electronic bank dispatch system (CEB) located in Bismarck is connected to 37 towers statewide via telephone and/or data circuits.

The existing central electronic bank dispatch system (CEB) is a card based system with ties to 37 towers across the state. A study contracted by the Office of Emergency Communications (OEC) during the spring of 2010, indicated that twelve (12) towers needed to be added to the state's system. The existing system will only support the addition of two (2) more towers, for connectivity to a total of 39 towers. In order to provide appropriate mobile coverage throughout the state, the existing CEB system must be updated to a more modern technology

### Business Needs and Problems

The existing CEB uses technology that is at the end of sale life for hardware and replacement parts, support will not be available after 2016. The system must be updated in order to continue to support the needs of the state.

1. The current CEB is old; the technology is no longer being sold. As a result replacement parts are becoming increasingly difficult to locate.
2. A recent study completed indicated that ND requires the addition of 12 towers (to the existing 37). The existing CEB cannot support any more than the addition of two new towers. In addition, the CEB must be updated prior to the addition of the towers.
3. System currently uses voting for channel 3 statewide mutual aid. This was a short term fix to get longer life out of existing system. The voting system has caused some interoperability problems with public safety communication.

### Key Metrics

Project Start Date	Project End Date	Original Baseline Budget
03/18/2013	06/30/2013	\$1,100,000

### Objectives

Project Objectives	Measurement Description
The new system will be supported and will have the ability to obtain parts as/if needed.	Able to secure maintenance contracts Ability to procure hardware as needed
Ability to expand state coverage to the appropriate number of towers.	Within the next biennium additional towers will be constructed utilizing current and future legislative allocations.
Infrastructure will support addition of more than two towers.	Successful addition of third tower
Replace the voting system with a more conventional product.	Voting system is discontinued
More effective connectivity communication with channel 3 statewide mutual aid.	More than one unit can effectively communicate on the system concurrently

# CEB Project Startup Report

Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

## Cost/Benefit Analysis

- The total funds available for the project are estimated to be: \$1.1 million.
- DES conducts planning, coordination, communications, and operations for the safety and security of all citizens in North Dakota. By updating/replacing the current CEB, DES will continue to meet the safety needs of the state.

## Key Constraints or Risks

- Complete project by May 31, 2013
- Budget cap (\$1.1 million)
- Delays due to weather or safety delays, may impact installation of equipment.
- Cost, schedule, scope, and quality are often in conflict during projects. The sponsor elected to prioritize as follows:
  1. Schedule
  2. Quality
  3. Cost
  4. Scope

# Project Startup Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

**Project Name:** Eligibility System Modernization

**Agency:** Department of Human Services

**Business Unit/Program Area:** Medicaid, Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), and Economic Assistance Programs

**Project Sponsor:** Carol Cartledge, Heather Steffl, Jenny Witham

**Project Manager:** Val Brostrom

### Project Description

The Department of Human Services currently determines eligibility for medical assistance, children's health insurance program, cash assistance, supplemental nutrition, child care assistance and heating assistance in four separate information systems. Two of these systems will be heavily impacted by the modifications required to comply with the Patient Protection & Affordable Care Act (ACA) passed by Congress in March 2010. The ACA legislation will broadly expand Medicaid coverage to nearly anyone with an income up to 138% of the federal poverty level (no longer limited to low-income children, pregnant women and disabled adults). The objective of this project is to replace our current eligibility systems with a single system that will meet the requirements of the ACA as well as streamline the application process for our constituents.

### Business Needs and Problems

1. Incorporation of ACA requirements to meet compliance date of January 1, 2014; allowing for initial enrollment by October 1, 2013 with the completion of the entire system by December 31, 2015.
2. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) has issued new standards and conditions that must be met by the states in order for Medicaid technology investments for eligibility systems to be eligible for the enhanced federal funding percentage (i.e. 90% federal matching percentage rate).
3. A single eligibility system for medical assistance and all economic assistance programs which provides for sharing of information regarding clients interactively amongst its service programs resulting in increased efficiency, ease of use, mobility of the application, and effective reporting for decision making.

### Key Metrics

Project Start Date	Project End Date	Original Baseline Budget
05/07/2013	06/30/2017	\$59,290,077

### Objectives

Project Objectives	Measurement Description
<u>Objective 1.1:</u> Meet federally mandated requirements to integrate with the federal HBE.	<u>Measurement 1.1.1:</u> Successful send and receipt of all defined eligibility transactions from the federal hub and completion of the enrollment and/or reenrollment processes by October 1, 2013.
<u>Objective 1.2:</u> In order to apply the correct Federal Matching Percentage (FMAP) for Medicaid enrollees, the system must be able to determine upon enrollment whether the individual's authorization was based upon existing eligibility criteria or the criteria created by the ACA.	<u>Measurement 1.2.1:</u> Determine methodology the state will deploy for determining the application of FMAP by December 31, 2012. <u>Measurement 1.2.2:</u> The system is able to correctly report claims payment data by FMAP upon go live
<u>Objective 1.3:</u> Creation of real-time application process.	<u>Measurement 1.3.2:</u> Public facing application in which the client is capable of completing the application for Medicaid and CHIP online upon go live.
<u>Objective 2.1:</u> Meet the system requirements	All of the following measurements must be included in the

# Project Startup Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

as outlined in the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid (CMS) *Enhanced Funding Requirements: Seven Conditions and Standards (MITS-11-01)*

APD submission, be addressed in the Gate Review for concept of operations, and be present upon project completion.

Measurement 2.1.1: Modularity Standard - This condition requires the use of a modular, flexible approach to systems development, including the use of open interfaces and exposed application programming interfaces (API); the separation of business rules from core programming; and the availability of business rules in both human and machine-readable formats. Including:

- Use of Systems Development Lifecycle methodologies. States should use a system development lifecycle (SDLC) methodology for improved efficiency and quality of products and services.
- Identification and description of open interfaces: States should emphasize the flexibility of open interfaces and exposed APIs as components for the service layer.
- Use of business rules engines. States should ensure the use of business rules engines to separate business rules from core programming, and should provide information about the change control process that will manage development and implementation of business rules.
- Submission of business rules to a HHS-designated repository. States should be prepared to submit all their business rules in human-readable form to an HHS repository, which will be made available to other states and to the public.

Measurement 2.1.2: MITA Condition - This condition requires states to align to and advance increasingly in MITA maturity for business, architecture, and data. Including:

- MITA Self Assessments. CMS expects all states to complete a self-assessment and may wait until version 3.0 is published (expected in 2011).
- MITA Roadmaps. States will provide to CMS a MITA Maturity Model Roadmap that addresses goals and objectives, as well as key activities and milestones, covering a 5-year outlook for their proposed MMIS solution, as part of the APD process.
- Concept of Operations (COO) and Business Process Models (BPM). States should develop a concept of operations and business work flows for the different business functions of the \state to advance the alignment of the state's capability maturity with the MITA Maturity Model (MMM).

Measurement 2.1.3: Industry Standard condition - States must ensure alignment with, and incorporation of, industry standards: the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) security, privacy and transaction standards; accessibility standards established under section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, or standards that provide greater accessibility for individuals with disabilities, and compliance with federal civil rights laws; standards adopted by the Secretary under section 1104 of the Affordable Care Act; and

# Project Startup Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

standards and protocols adopted by the Secretary under section 1561 of the Affordable Care Act. Including:

- Identification of industry standards. CMS will communicate applicable standards to states. Standards would be updated periodically to ensure conformance with changes in the industry.
- Incorporation of industry standards in requirements, development, and testing phases. States must implement practices and procedures for the system development phases such as requirements analysis, system testing, and user acceptance testing (UAT).

Measurement 2.1.4: Leverage Condition - State solutions should promote sharing, leverage, and reuse of Medicaid technologies and systems within and among states. Including:

- Multi-state efforts. States should identify any components and solutions that are being developed with the participation of or contribution by other states.
- Availability for reuse. States should identify any components and solutions that have high applicability for other reuse by other states, how other states will participate in advising and reviewing these artifacts, and the development and testing path for these solutions and components will promote reuse.
- Identification of open source, cloud-based and commercial products. States should pursue a service-based and cloud-first strategy for system development.
- Customization. States will identify the degree and amount of customization needed for any transfer solutions, and how such customization will be minimized.
- Transition and retirement plans. States should identify existing duplicative system services within the state and seek to eliminate duplicative system services if the work is cost effective such as lower total cost of ownership over the long term.

Measurement 2.1.5: Business Results Condition - Systems should support accurate and timely processing of claims (including claims of eligibility), adjudications, and effective communications with providers, beneficiaries, and the public. Including:

- Degree of automation. The state should be highly automated in systematic processing of claims (including claims of eligibility) and steps to accept, process, and maintain all adjudicated claims/transactions.
- Customer service. States should document how they will produce a 21st-century customer and partner experience for all individuals (applicants, beneficiaries, plans, and providers).
- Performance standards and testing. CMS intends to provide additional guidance concerning performance standards—both functional and non-functional, and with respect to service level agreements (SLA) and key performance indicators (KPI).

# Project Startup Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

	<p><u>Measurement 2.1.6:</u> Reporting Condition - Solutions should produce transaction data, reports, and performance information that would contribute to program evaluation, continuous improvement in business operations, and transparency and accountability.</p> <p><u>Measurement 2.1.7:</u> Interoperability Condition - Systems must ensure seamless coordination and integration with the Exchange (whether run by the state or federal government), and allow interoperability with health information exchanges, public health agencies, human services programs, and community organizations providing outreach and enrollment assistance services. Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interactions with the Exchange. States should ensure that open interfaces are established and maintained with any federal data services hub and that requests to the hub are prepared and available for submission immediately after successful completion of the application for eligibility.</li> <li>▪ Interactions with other entities. States should consult with and discuss how the proposed systems development path will support interoperability with health information exchanges, public health agencies, and human services programs to promote effective customer service and better clinical management and health services to beneficiaries.</li> </ul> <p><u>Measurement 2.1.8:</u> A state self-assessment will be completed after the release of the final MITA 3.0 guidelines.</p>
<p><u>Objective 3.1:</u> Increase efficiency in application processing for each program.</p>	<p><u>Measurement 3.1.1:</u> Reduction in the meantime from which an application is received until the application is authorized. The mean time and expected reduction for each program will be identified during the project and met within six months of go live for that program.</p> <p><u>Measurement 3.1.2:</u> Utilization of online reauthorization at go-live.</p>
<p><u>Objective 3.2:</u> The system is user friendly.</p>	<p><u>Measurement 3.2.1:</u> Conduct survey of Eligibility workers within three months of application roll-out with a 90% approval rating.</p> <p><u>Measurement 3.2.1:</u> Request online customer feedback at end of application process with a 90% approval rating for six months post implementation.</p>
<p><u>Objective 3.3:</u> Web based application is accessible from any location using multiple devices types including PCs, smartphones, and tablets.</p>	<p><u>Measurement 3.3.1:</u> Successful application access and interaction through identified devices during acceptance testing.</p>
<p><u>Objective 3.4:</u> Application will include business intelligence features which allows for tracking in real-time key performance measures as well as long term trending via data warehouse solution.</p>	<p><u>Measurement 3.4.1:</u> Key performance measures are captured during requirements gathering and demonstration of functionality confirmed during user acceptance testing.</p> <p><u>Measurement 3.4.2:</u> Project will include data extraction, transfer, and load to external data store with business intelligence functionality which will allow stakeholders to query and generate ad hoc reports.</p>

# Project Startup Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

### Cost/Benefit Analysis

The 62<sup>nd</sup> Legislative Assembly passed House Bill 1475 appropriating \$42,617,925 to rewrite the DHS Eligibility Determination systems. Based on initial estimates, this amount includes all costs and risk.

### Key Constraints or Risks

#### Constraints:

The project has the following constraints:

- Availability of CMS federal funding at a 90/10 federal match for eligibility requirements related to ACA will end December 31, 2015.
- Availability of technical standards for ACA requirements, such as specifications for interfacing with the federal data hub and the federal exchange.
- Cost, schedule, scope, and quality are often in conflict during projects. The governing committee elected to prioritize as follows:
  1. Schedule
  2. Quality
  3. Cost
  4. Scope

#### Risks of Performing the Project:

Risk: Limited resources to complete the project.

Impact: Staff from both ITD and DHS may need to have work reassigned. ITD will need to augment staff by hiring contractors.

Risk: Regulation that has largest impact on eligibility system integration with the health benefit exchange was released as a Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPR) on August 12, 2011. It is unknown when the final rules will be released.

Impact: This uncertainty hinders our ability to fully understand the intent of the proposed regulations.

Risk: The design of the new system is based on the external exchange mechanism that determines eligibility base on the Medicaid Modified Adjusted Gross Income. If the federal initiative to build health care exchanges is redacted, the new Eligibility system will need to incorporate this functionality.

Impact: Depending where we are in the life of the project, there could be an impact to the cost and schedule due to rework of completed deliverables.

#### Risks of Not Performing the Project:

Risk: DHS would need to incorporate new eligibility rules for Medicaid under ACA into the Legacy eligibility systems. Current systems do not have the capability of a real-time application process.

Impact: Inefficient usage of state resources would be expended on new functionality using an outdated technology platform.

Impact: Lose ability to take advantage of federal 90/10 funding match.

Risk: Legacy Medicaid and CHIP eligibility systems would have limited ability to interact with the Federal Health Benefit Exchange due to its outdated technology platform.

Impact: The public would not have access to apply for assistance electronically. The state has the potential to be out of compliance.

Risk: Inefficient county worker operations for eligibility determination.

Impact: Would require the continued use of multiple eligibility determination systems.

Impact: Existing processes and maintenance activities remain antiquated.

# Project Startup Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

**Project Name:** Taxpayer Access Point (TAP)

**Agency:** Office of State Tax Commissioner

**Business Unit/Program Area:** Business Registration and Web File

**Project Sponsor:** Lucas Asche

**Project Manager:** Brandi Fagerland

### Project Description

This project will serve to replace our existing stand-alone webfile systems for sales tax and withholding tax by configuring them into the TAP system. TAP will provide taxpayers with a self-serving web application that will allow them to register their business, file and pay their taxes, and also maintain their accounts online. This application will be available to those who file and/or pay sales, city lodging, city lodging & restaurant, and/or withholding taxes. Taxpayers will be able to fill out and submit applications and other correspondence online, request permits & licenses, file their returns, upload documents and other attachments, make online payments, modify their account information, manage logins and access permissions to their accounts, view correspondence issued from our department, and also view notifications from us. TAP will be configured to utilize the North Dakota Login ID system. This will allow taxpayers to have a single sign-on user id across all state agencies. North Dakota Login IDs registered with our current sales tax and withholding tax applications will also be converted to work with the TAP system so that existing users will not have to register with the new system to start using it. TAP will provide a rich user experience by providing instant feedback to users, including instant calculations on returns and other requests currently done by mailing in paper forms. TAP also supports a large variety of new and old web browsers. This will allow our web applications to be used by a large population base with a wide variety of systems without experiencing technical issues. Since TAP is integrated into our GenTax system, our department will be able to modify and enhance the product, utilizing the same tools we currently use to configure GenTax. This robust solution ensures that we will be able to make modifications to the system in a much easier and efficient manner, continue to upgrade and enhance TAP as we upgrade GenTax, and provide a better overall experience for our taxpayers.

### Business Needs and Problems

1. Improve customer service for taxpayers who file and pay withholding, sales, and restaurant & lodging taxes and expand availability of services.
  - a. Tax Department staff will have sufficient knowledge to provide prompt, accurate, and courteous customer service to the taxpayer for the tax types included in this project.
  - b. Streamline internal work processes
  - c. Taxpayers will be able to fulfill certain requests and submit documentation without direct interaction with agency staff, allowing them to do business 24x7.
2. Utilize the full potential of our integrated tax system. Currently, all web applications are hosted by ITD and indirectly tie into Gentax, which require ITD to be involved in making changes to the applications.
  - a. Eliminate the need for costly and time consuming application development services.
  - b. Tax Department staff, in conjunction with vendor on-site support, will maintain and upgrade as needed to accommodate legislative and business process changes for the tax types included in this project.

### Key Metrics

Project Start Date	Project End Date	Original Baseline Budget
10/16/2013	08/31/2014	\$967,085

### Objectives

Project Objectives	Measurement Description

# Project Startup Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

<p><u>Business Need/Problem 1:</u> Improve customer service for taxpayers who file and pay withholding, sales, and restaurant &amp; lodging taxes and expand availability of services.</p> <p><u>Objective 1.1:</u> Increase usage of electronic services by utilizing new technology, in turn, reducing costly paper processes.</p>	<p><u>Measurement 1.1.1:</u> Increase Webfile utilization by five percent for sales and withholding taxes within the first six months after project completion. For taxes new to Webfile, have an adoption rate of 50% in the first six months after project completion.</p> <p><u>Measurement 1.1.2:</u> Have eighty percent of new taxpayers register online through TAP within six months of project completion.</p> <p><u>Measurement 1.1.3:</u> Have eighty percent of new taxpayers who submit electronic applications also file/pay electronically within six months of project completion.</p> <p><u>Measurement 1.1.4:</u> Reduce the time it takes to process applications to less than two business days within the first three months of project completion.</p> <p><u>Measurement 1.1.5:</u> Reduce mailing costs for the associated tax types by ten percent within six months of project completion.</p>
<p><u>Business Need/Problem 2:</u> Utilize the full potential of our integrated tax system.</p> <p><u>Objective 2.1:</u> Eliminate the need to contract for expensive and time-sensitive application programming changes to accommodate legislative and business process changes.</p>	<p><u>Measurement 2.1.1:</u> Eliminate ITD application programming costs for the taxes referenced in the scope of services within three months after project completion.</p> <p><u>Measurement 2.1.2:</u> Department staff will have the knowledge to configure other applications/processes in TAP within six months after project completion.</p>

### Cost/Benefit Analysis

Anticipated Benefit(s): Reduced phone calls and paper requests, track work more efficiently, and allow staff more time to work on other revenue generating activities. We will also have additional data readily available for other tax administration purposes.

Anticipated Benefit(s): Reduce the amount of time needed to fulfill taxpayer requests, as well as save money by utilizing internal IT staff, in conjunction with our vendor, make any necessary updates/changes to the system.

### Key Constraints or Risks

Constraint: Fixed Project Completion Date

- This project has a specified project length of one year and must be completed by June 30, 2015.
- This is set by funding and legislatively imposed expectations.

Constraint: Limited Project Budget

- North Dakota Legislative Assembly approved \$1.0M dollars for this project.
- This is a hard and fast ceiling and cannot be exceeded.

Risk: Taxpayer education/Insufficient training.

Impact: Taxpayers may not be able access or file/pay their taxes on time. This may also lead to increased phone calls from frustrated taxpayers.

Response: Online training will be provided, which will include videos, webinars, and documentation.

Risk: Problems with conversion of existing Webfile accounts to TAP

Impact: Taxpayers would have to set up their accounts manually and may not have proper access to their information.

# Project Startup Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

Response: Ensure all existing accounts are converted properly by cross-checking data with current system data.

# Project Startup Report

Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

**Project Name:** NDVH – Electronic Medical Record

**Agency:** NDVH

**Business Unit/Program Area:**

**Project Sponsor:** Mark Johnson

**Project Manager:** Kari Nishek

## Project Description

The North Dakota Veterans Home (NDVH) plans to upgrade its medical records program to a new electronic health records (EHR) program. The EHR system includes point of care (POC), electronic medication (eMAR), electronic treatments (eTAR), minimum data set (MDS) process, care planning, assessments, charting, reports, physician orders, electronic lab requests / results, resident census, accounts receivable, trust accounts and electronic insurance claims. This EHR system would comply with federal electronic health records requirements, state health information exchange and auditor's requirements.

## Business Needs and Problems

Business Needs:

1. NDVH will be unable to submit MDS with their current MDI program after 05/17/13 which will result in a loss of \$240,000 per month in federal reimbursements.
2. The strategic goal of the NDVH is to convert from a paper-based medical records system to a fully electronic health records system in order to comply with federal and state requirements.
3. The State Auditor says the accounting component does provide a sufficient audit trail and should include sequential transaction numbers.

## Key Metrics

Project Start Date	Project End Date	Original Baseline Budget
08/01/2013	04/14/2013	\$476,600

## Objectives

Project Objectives	Measurement Description
1.1 MDS Submission	1.1.1 Federal and State accepted NDVH MDS submissions
2.2 The new EHR system should comply with Federal and State requirements	2.1.1 Upon first production use, the new EHR system meets HIPAA, HITECT and HIE standards
2.2.1 The new EHR system will be a federal Certified system	2.2.1 Upon first production use, the new EHR certified by Certification Commission for Health Information Technology (CCHIT) and meaning full use by Office National Coordinator for Health Information Technology (ONC) for Long Term and Post Acute care (LTPAC).
3.1 The accounting module must meet State Auditor's requirements	3.1.1 Upon first production use, the accounting module must provide audit trails and sequential transaction numbers for all accounting transactions.

# Project Startup Report

Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

Cost/Benefit Analysis			
	Appropriated	Reallocated	Total
<b>Project Costs</b>			
Hardware			
Software/Licenses	\$45,000	\$53,500	\$98,500
Implementation Plan, Setup Conversion & Training	\$67,000	\$107,000	\$174,000
Project Management		\$25,000	\$25,000
Large Project Oversight		\$2,500	\$2,500
Maintenance Fees		\$16,909	\$16,909
Hosting Fees		\$6,556	\$6,556
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$112,000</b>	<b>\$211,465</b>	<b>\$323,465</b>
Risk Contingency		\$50,000	\$50,000
<b>Baseline Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$112,000</b>	<b>\$261,465</b>	<b>\$373,465</b>
Management Reserve		\$39,600	\$39,600
Non-Project Maint. Fees	\$17,755		\$17,755
Non-Project Hosting Fees	\$6,884		\$6,884
<b>Budget Total</b>	<b>\$136,639</b>	<b>\$301,065</b>	<b>\$437,704</b>

Key Constraints or Risks
<p><b><u>Identified Risks by NDVH:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The new EHR system is not able to produce acceptable MDS electronic reports.            Impact: This would have a severe impact on the NDVH as skilled reimbursements are linked to these reports.            Response: This is a very low probability of occurrence because the Health MEDX MDS system provides acceptable reports with hundreds of other LTC clients.</li>   <li>2. The new EHR accounting module is not acceptable to the State Auditor.            Impact: If the new EHR accounting is not acceptable to the State Auditor, the NDVH would not be in compliance.            Response: Health MEDX has assured us their accounting system has sequential transaction numbers and they do have the reports required by the State Auditor.</li>   <li>3. One of the many modules in the Health MEDX program may not fully meet the needs of the NDVH.            Impact: The impact will vary depending on which module does not meet the needs of NDVH. The key modules are MDS and accounting and are identified above.</li> </ol>

# Project Startup Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

Response: A problem with the one of the modules cannot be identified until the system is fully operational. The Health MEDX team is very dedicated and will make every effort to correct any problems.

4. The EHR vendor goes out of business or drops support for the program. This has occurred with the NDVH's last three electronic medical records systems.

Impact: The NDVH would have to start over with selection, conversion, training and setup of another EHR program.

Response: The probability of occurrence is very low because Health MEDX is the 2<sup>nd</sup> largest EHR provider for LTC.

# Project Startup Report

Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

**Project Name:** Recruiting Solutions Project

**Agency:** Office of Management and Budget

**Business Unit/Program Area:** HRMS

**Project Sponsor:** Laurie Sterioti-Hammeren / Darin Schorsch

**Project Manager:** Darin Anderson

## Project Description

Two state agencies are using Talent Acquisition Manager (TAM) on a limited basis, but without Candidate Gateway the use of TAM is very labor intensive requiring the agency to manually enter candidate data into the system. With Candidate Gateway, the candidate enters their personal information into the system eliminating the work for the agency.

State agencies have expressed a desire to automate the recruiting process. Currently, candidates apply to State of ND with paper-based applications and resumes via regular mail or e-mail. The screening process is a paper-based, manual process.

## Business Needs and Problems

Specific business needs identified are:

1. Ability to post jobs online.
2. Electronic application process for candidates to eliminate data entry burden on state resources.
3. Online prescreening process for candidates to ensure they meet the minimum qualifications for the position.
4. Streamlined communications with candidates.
5. Integrated prescreen scoring, automatic generation of Certificate of Eligibles for the interviewing process.
6. Create recruiting statistics for Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) /Affirmative Action and other records for agencies that require this information.

## Key Metrics

Project Start Date	Project End Date	Original Baseline Budget
10/25/2013	02/14/2012	\$885,542

## Objectives

Project Objectives	Measurement Description
<b>Objective 1.1:</b> Implement an enterprise-level software system for recruiting and hiring employees. All agencies will have the ability to create job openings and track candidates through the hiring process.	<b>Measurement 1.1:</b> Within 3 months of implementation 100% of state agencies that currently utilize PeopleSoft, will use the system templates for job postings.
	<b>Measurement 1.2:</b> Upon implementation the RS system will store an electronic record of all candidates who applied for the position.
	<b>Measurement 1.3:</b> Within 6 months track the number of applicants compared to prior same position(s) (percent to be determined in planning)
	<b>Measurement 1.4:</b> After one year of implementation, track the number of applicants compared to the open position(s) (year over year) (percent to be determined in planning)

# Project Startup Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

**Objective 2.1:** Online application process for candidates to submit applications with the ability to save a profile to apply for multiple positions.

**Measurement 2.1:** Upon implementation the candidate portal will be available 24/7 for candidates to apply for positions at any time.

**Measurement 2.2:** Upon implementation paper application submissions will be reduced by 85%.

**Objective 3.1:** For State of ND will use RS to automatically determine if the minimum qualifications are met by the applicant for the position.

**Measurement 3.1:** Upon implementation, If applicant does not meet minimum qualifications or standard criteria, they are disqualified. The qualified applicants are identified in the system and proceed through the application screening process.

**Measurement 3.2:** Within 3 months reduce HR personnel hours to manually screen applications by 25%

**Objective 4.1:** RS will deliver job offers to applicants with notification via email and job offers posted in the applicant's portal. This will include the status of the application and job offers.

**Measurement 4.1:** Upon implementation RS will use templates for job offer letters and emails to communicate with candidates.

**Objective 5.1:** Use RS to define the interviewing team, generate Certificate of Eligibles, schedule interviews with the interviewing team and applicant(s), maintain record of the interview guides, and update applicant status.

**Measurement 5.1:** Within seven days of the Certificate of Eligibles being created, the RS system will notify Recruiters and Hiring Managers through email. Recruiters and Hiring Managers will then have the ability to use RS to schedule interviews with applicants. Applicants will be notified within 24 hours (via email).

**Measurement 5.2:** RS system will maintain a record of interview guides for the interviewing team.

**Measurement 5.3:** RS system will integrate with current scheduling systems such as MS Outlook for scheduling interviews.

**Objective 6.1:** Track all applicants that have applied for each position based on EEO/ Affirmative Action categories.

**Measurement 6.1:** Once the position filled the required statistics will be available to the requesting agency(s) within RS.

### Cost/Benefit Analysis

For the State of ND, job postings are submitted by e-mail to Human Resource Management Services (HRMS) to post on the [www.nd.gov/hrms](http://www.nd.gov/hrms) website. As a result of the multiple manual processes, there is no unified system that tracks and automates the recruiting process for recruiters, and the application process for candidates is very cumbersome and outdated. This has led to complaints from candidates and ultimately lost potential employees.

### Key Constraints or Risks

Risk: The PeopleSoft HCM 9.2 upgrade environment availability. This suitable 9.2 environment must be available prior to the Recruiting Solutions implementation. Any delays to the upgrade project will delay Recruiting Solutions.

# **Project Startup Report**

## **Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013**

Risk: Agencies have requested the functionality provided by this project and would continue to pursue using shadow systems to meet their business needs, in opposition to the enterprise solution.

Risk: Agencies would continue to provide this functionality using manual processes resulting in a segmented, non-integrated process across the state.

# CEB Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

**Project Name:** Central Electronics Bank Replacement Project (CEB)

**Agency:** North Dakota Department of Emergency Services

**Business Unit/Program Area:** State Radio

**Project Sponsor:** Mike Lynk

**Project Manager:** Aaron Kielhack

Objectives		
Project Objectives	Measurements	
	Met/ Not Met	Description
The new system will be supported and will have the ability to obtain parts as/if needed.	Met	The Zetron system is fully supported and spare parts have already been ordered by NDDDES/State Radio.
Ability to expand state coverage to the appropriate number of towers.	Met	Within the next biennium additional towers will be constructed utilizing current and future legislative allocations- this is due to the deployment of the new system.
Replace the voting system with a more conventional product.	Met	Voting system was turned off.
More effective connectivity communication with channel 3 statewide mutual aid.	Met	More than one unit is able to effectively communicate on the system concurrently.
Infrastructure will support addition of more than two towers.	Met	Plans are already underway to expand the number of tower sites.

Schedule Objectives					
Met/ Not Met	Original Baseline Schedule (in Months)	Final Baseline Schedule (in Months)	Actual Schedule (in Months)	Variance to Original Baseline	Variance to Final Baseline
Met	2 Months	2 Months	2 Months	0.0%	0.0%

*The metrics are for the execution phase schedule*

Budget Objectives					
Met/ Not Met	Original Baseline Budget	Final Baseline Budget	Actual Costs	Variance to Original Baseline	Variance to Final Baseline
Met	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	\$1,013,823	3% Under	3% Under

Major Scope Changes
There were no major scope changes after planning was completed.

Lessons Learned
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The system works when communication works.</li> <li>• Zetron should have provided a project manager from the start of the project.</li> <li>• There seems to be recurring bugs that are taking a long time to resolve.</li> <li>• Vendor needed to implement several new version of software throughout project to solve issues. This delayed the project.</li> </ul>

# CEB Project Closeout Report

Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

## Success Stories

- The project brought the Land Mobile Radio system to an IP environment and gave State Radio the ability to add additional towers to fill communication gap areas.
- This system will allow State Radio the ability to move the dispatch center to another location.
- The new system is user friendly and a good technical advancement.
- The project was completed before the end of the current biennium.

# Project Closeout Report

**Project Name:** PERSLink

**Agency:** North Dakota Public Employees Retirement System

**Project Sponsor:** Sparb Collins

**Project Manager:** Sharon Schiermeister

Objectives		
Project Objectives	Measurements	
	Met/ Not Met	Description
Complete the project on or under budget with the full scope completed	Met	<p>The appropriated budget for the project is \$9,594,000.</p> <p>It was determined that PERS Staffing costs should also be included as part of the budget and tracked. Therefore, an additional \$980,214 was added to the budget to reflect PERS Staff time, resulting in a total budget of \$10,502,214.</p>
Complete the project on schedule with the full scope completed. The project will be implemented using phased roll-outs	Partially Met	<p>The project is scheduled to be completed by September 30, 2010</p> <p>The first rollout was completed on October 1, 2008 which deployed functionality for the call center, upfront imaging and workflow. The second rollout was completed on October 3, 2010 which deployed 98% of the business functionality and Employer Self Service on-schedule as noted above. However, NDPERS decided to delay rolling out the Member Self Service functionality until it could be determined that NDPERS members would have minimal issues with the interface. The study and change requests that resulted delayed the rollout of that functionality until September 2012.</p>
Transition to the new system without interrupting operations so that the transition is transparent to the membership	Partially Met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain at least the same level of customer service satisfaction ratings as measured on the report cards</li> <li>Continue processing monthly retirement payments, benefit enrollments, new retirements, refund requests, insurance premiums, retirement contributions and deferred comp contributions within timeframes currently in place</li> </ul> <p>Throughout the project, NDPERS was able to maintain operations and consistent levels of service to our customers. However, the deployment in October 2010 introduced significant change not only to NDPERS staff, but also to our participating employers. At that time, we experienced delays processing retirement and deferred comp contributions, as well as being able to respond to employer questions within our customary timeframes. This improved within 12 months after go-live.</p>
The new system will need to be adaptable to future benefit changes and requirements.	Met	<p>Within 6 months after the system is fully implemented, NDPERS staff will have the training and experience to make routine changes to the system, such as parameters, business rules and other table driven elements</p>

# Project Closeout Report

<p>Get membership to use web based self-service functionality to change personal information (such as address, designation of beneficiary) freeing up staff to handle more complex requests</p>	<p>Partially Met</p>	<p>10% of such transactions will be handled via Self-Service within 6 months; 50% will be handled via Self-Service within 2 years.</p> <p>Member Self Service has not yet been fully deployed to all of the membership, therefore, transactions can only be conducted through self service by a limited number of people. The initial deployment in September 2012 was a pilot for employees of 12 pilot employers. These employers covered approximately 5,200 active employees. During the annual enrollment season, 1,372 employees used MSS to make their 2013 annual enrollment elections. Also, from September 2012 – December 2012, 5,996 plan enrollments or enrollment changes were submitted through MSS. Over 95% of the transactions for these employees were handled via self-service.</p>
<p>Get employers to use web based self-service functionality for enrollments, terminations, changes in status and payroll reporting, freeing up staff to handle exceptions, rather than normal processing.</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>Employers representing 90% of the members will be handled via self-service within 6 months of go-live</p> <p>Employers representing 99% of the members were handled via self-service the first month of go-live.</p>
<p>Capture the institutional knowledge of NDPERS in the business rules of the system or other documentation related to the project</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>At go-live, the business rules for the following processes will be captured in the new business system, including documentation on exception processing; eligibility, enrollments, terminations, refunds/rollovers, retirements, deaths, service purchases, employer reporting, benefit estimates, court orders, disabilities.</p>
<p>Reduce the number of business function spreadsheets currently used by staff by integrating information into the new system</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>Eliminate 50% of the spreadsheets within 3 months of go-live; 80% within 6 months</p>
<p>Improve integration with vendors (insurance carriers, deferred comp providers, PeopleSoft payroll) to reduce duplicate data entry and the transfer of paper</p>	<p>Partially Met</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PeopleSoft payroll: Information such as address changes and benefit enrollments will only need to be entered once, instead of multiple times (NDPERS, employees, employers)</li> <li>• Insurance, retirement and deferred comp vendors: Information such as address changes and benefit enrollments/changes will only need to be entered once, instead of multiple times (NDPERS, vendor)</li> </ul> <p>NDPERS was able to successfully improve integration with the vendors for the insurance plans, DC retirement plan and deferred comp companion plan which eliminated duplicate data entry and the transfer of paper.</p> <p>The integration with the State and Higher Ed PeopleSoft payroll system has not been fully accomplished yet. This has been determined to be a worthwhile objective and will continue to be pursued in 2013.</p>
<p>All benefit plans are integrated on the new system</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>At go-live, all benefit plans, with the exception of FlexComp claims processing, will be integrated on the new system</p>

# Project Closeout Report

## Schedule Objectives

Met/ Not Met	Original Baseline Schedule (in Months)	Final Baseline Schedule (in Months)	Actual Schedule (in Months)	Variance to Original Baseline	Variance to Final Baseline
Met	34	34	34	On Schedule	On Schedule
Not Met	34	53	57	67.6% OVER	7.2% OVER

### Notes:

1. The first line refers to the implementation of the Line of Business functionality completed on 10/3/2010. This implementation made 98% of the entire PERSLink project functionality available to NDPERS users and employers.
2. The second line refers to the implementation of the remaining Member Self Service web functionality completed on 09/04/2012. This functionality was part of the original project plan. However, the decision was made to delay implementation of this feature so the project rebaselined the schedule after the initial go-live.

## Budget Objectives

Met/ Not Met	Original Baseline Budget	Final Baseline Budget	Actual Costs	Variance to Original Baseline	Variance to Final Baseline
Met	10,502,214	10,502,214	10,069,779	432,435 Under Budget (4.1%)	432,435 Under Budget (4.1%)

## Major Scope Changes

Scope changes were identified as part of JAD sessions and during User Acceptance Testing as either new requirements or functionality enhancements. As agreed contractually, the PERSLink Project Management team tracked and monitored additions and deletions of requirements and the net amount was summarized in Change Orders. A total of 10 Change Orders were issued for a total of \$421,740 that came out of the PERSLink Project Contingency Fund. The Steering Committee was informed monthly. The table below is an example of the Enhancements summary presented to the Steering Committee. Nine of these changes did not impact the schedule.

The most significant change was the decision to postpone the deployment of the Member Self Service functionality and conduct a usability study. This change impacted both schedule and cost:

- The impact on the schedule is highlighted in the Schedule section above
- The impact on cost has the following components
  - Usability study = \$ 46,610.29
  - Additional Sagitec cost = Sagitec agreed to support the new schedule at no additional cost, except for the changes identified as enhancements which totaled \$121,176

## Lessons Learned

The PERSLink team conducted a total of 15 lessons learned sessions throughout the life of the project. The lessons learned sessions focused on identifying what is working well and areas of improvement. Specific actions were taken to implement suggested changes in the next phase of the project. A complete list of all lessons learned sessions is stored on the NDPERS SharePoint site.

Here is a summary of what worked well:

- Management and sponsor support of the project were at the right level. There was no interference in day to day project activities. The NDPERS Project Manager was given the appropriate level of decision-making authority.
- Team work, cooperation, and open communication between NDPERS, Sagitec, LRWL and ITD. Issues were handled as a team with a problem-solving approach, rather than being adversarial.
- Using SharePoint as the central repository for project documents allowed all members of the project team to access and share documents, regardless of where they were located – on-site, off-site or off-shore.
- The defined process for gathering requirements through Joint Application Design (JAD) sessions and documenting the requirements and business flows in the Use Case documents.

# Project Closeout Report

- Hiring a usability consultant to assist with the design of Member Self Service, conduct usability studies and provide recommendations was directly related to successful deployment and user acceptance of MSS.

Here is a summary of what needed improvement:

- Have more of a phased implementation, even if it adds extra effort
- Assign dedicated resources from client and vendor side, early in the project, to manage data conversion. Vendor resource should spend as much time as possible on-site.
- Take time to review training materials even if it means delaying go live. Training should cover business life cycle.
- Perform life cycle and integration testing prior to going live, even if it means delaying go-live.
- Employers should have been involved in testing Employer Self Service to identify usability issues prior to go-live.

## Success Stories

The most relevant success story was the implementation of the PERSLink project Line of Business functionality on time and within budget as detailed below. This project resulted in a complete change in how NDPERS staff performed their duties, how NDPERS passed information to their vendors, how participating employers submitted information and conduct business with NDPERS, and how members interact with NDPERS.

### Partnership for success

Software development projects typically have a long life cycle with the participation of people from multiple areas and backgrounds that go through periods of intense work together. It is common to have three or more companies that join efforts and provide the people to work together to accomplish the project.

Leadership plays an important role in this process and, as we discuss here, partnership is the key for success. The PERSLink project included four major organizations:

- **North Dakota Public Employees Retirement System (NDPERS)** – sponsored the project, provided business process expertise and participated with a Core Team including the roles of Project Sponsor, Project Manager, Benefits and Accounting Experts, IT Staff
- **Sagitec Solutions, LLC** – proposed the solution to meet NDPERS requirements, based on Neospin Framework and participated with a team including the roles of Project Manager, Delivery Manager, Functional Analyst, Technical Architect, Developer and Communication specialist.
- **L. R. Wechsler, Ltd. (LRWL)** – developed the initial Request for Proposal and participated with the roles of Oversight Project Manager and Q/A
- **North Dakota Information Technology Department (ITD)** – responsible for the IT infrastructure to support the application and participated with a team including the roles of Large Project Oversight Analyst (LPOA), Technical Architect, Developer and DBA

The PERSLink project started in October 2007 and immediately the implementation team confronted the challenge of working together despite having never done so. The underlying structure for their partnership was the intentional team-building that started during the first week of the project and continued throughout the project's entire life cycle. Early on the team embraced a team-building process as a way to work effectively together. Using the basic concepts from the book The Team Handbook, by Peter R. Scholtes, they reviewed the phases of team-building, established ground rules for working together, and set the procedures for periodic reviews of the team-building process and for capturing lessons learned.

As one of the first team building exercises, the team defined their mission:

"We commit to successfully implement a robust, reliable, secure web-enabled, integrated benefit administration system that improves NDPERS' business operations and service."

During the early days of the project, the team encountered challenges and celebrated early accomplishments. Together, they assured that all system functionality was analyzed and documented according to Use Case specifications, that the software was developed and tested properly, and that documentation was created to record the impact to workflow. After the completion of each major phase of the project, the implementation team conducted a lessons learned session and captured what worked well

# Project Closeout Report

and what needed to change for each phase.

As the project moved on, involvement from NDPERS staff was critical as the team progressed into User Acceptance Testing, Online Help Documentation review, Training, Data Conversion and Migration, and Deployment of the new PERSLink system into production. The final implementation also required significant effort, led by the NDPERS PERSLink Core Team, to transform NDPERS business processes and effectively use the new system functionality.

Each participant company played an important and unique role in the partnership throughout the project life cycle. The LRWL Project Manager was very effective in supporting the NDPERS Project Manager, working with Sagitec in the development and execution of decision processes for Scope Management, Issue Management and Risk Management, and identifying and helping find the solution to issues as they impacted team performance and schedule. The LRWL QA role successfully supported the completion of User Acceptance Testing, User training and change management. The LRWL QA role was also very effective in supporting the review and approval of deliverables and Contract Management.

Sagitec brought a team of functional and technical experts with the tools and methodology appropriate for projects of this scale and facilitated the team-building process and the entire software development and implementation process.

ITD played a very important role, working with Sagitec to define and implement the technical architecture, providing expertise in key areas such as integration of PERSLink with Filenet. ITD architects, engineers and DBA participated in weekly project conference calls during the critical phases of the project to effectively address issues as they were identified and follow-up on action items.

The Steering Committee played a key role in overseeing the project and supporting the team. ITD LPOA and NDPERS Project Sponsor support of the project were at the right level. There was no interference in day to day project activities. Monthly steering committee reports and NDPERS Project Manager updates at weekly NDPERS manager meetings kept them sufficiently in the loop on the project status.

The NDPERS Core Team continuously worked with the Sagitec Project Team and LRWL to complete the planning of all the tasks and required resources from NDPERS, Sagitec and ITD, to implement the new PERSLink system in October 2010.

## **Result**

Through effective partnership in project management, the team accomplished their mission to deliver a state-of-the-industry benefits administration solution on time and within budget. PERSLink went live successfully on October 4, 2010.

So, what were the major ingredients of the team's partnership that lead to a successful project? We believe seven factors played a role:

### **1. Shared team goals**

All team players committed to the goal of implementing PERSLink by the agreed-upon deadline of October 2010. To accomplish the project mission as the team defined it, everyone came to the table with specific project goals from their own companies.

### **2. Trust and understanding**

Through the team-building process, the team became very familiar with each other and learned to listen, understand and trust. They knew they had successfully achieved the "Performing Stage" of Scholtes' stages of team development when all team members understand each other's strengths and weakness and supported each other to achieve the goals of the team.

### **3. Team process**

The PERSLink team exercised very open communication and always relied on the team processes to resolve issues and conflicts whenever they arrived. This does not mean that everyone agreed on every decision, but the team achieved consensus by admitting that everyone could support the decision and dedicate their efforts to implement it

### **4. Open feedback**

Through formal lessons-learned sessions or through other forms of communication, the team exercised open feedback to both reinforce positive behavior and influence change in unwanted behavior. The

# Project Closeout Report

feedback was captured during both the lessons-learned sessions and the project review meetings. Then, it was incorporated into the process whenever it made sense.

## 5. Clearly Defined Roles and Responsibilities

The Project Management Plans covered all major elements of project management, clearly defining the roles and responsibilities for planning, execution, tracking and monitoring, decision making and oversight.

## 6. Clear Communications

Communications included a variety of forms both written and verbal. The written communication was done through email and extensive documentation maintained in the PERSLink Portal, using SharePoint. The most valuable communication occurred in team meetings which included all major players and had specific agenda and follow-up items. A specific set of "Beneficial Behaviors" was encouraged during the meetings:

- Initiate discussions
- Balanced participation
- Seek information and opinions
- Suggest procedures for reaching a goal
- Clarify or elaborate on ideas
- Summarize
- Test for consensus
- Keep the discussion from digressing
- Compromise and be creative in resolving differences
- Try to ease tension in the group and work through difficult matters
- Get the group to agree on standards
- Refer to documentation and data
- Praise and correct others with equal firmness
- Accept both praise and complaints
- Provide feedback to other team members

## 7. Celebration important intermediate milestone accomplishments

Throughout the life of the project the team held celebration events at the completion of each major milestone. These were great opportunities to have some fun, improve team building and strengthen the partnership.

The successful implementation of PERSLink, delivered on time and within budget, was mainly a result of the spirit of partnership among the participants of the project. Their dedication to developing a high-performing team and to improving how the team worked together made this project a success.

Starting on October 4, 2010 and subsequent months the team stayed in place to support the initial use of the new system and successful transition into production support. PERSLink now supports all NDPERS key business process, provides interface with the Financial and Payroll System and is accessible by NDPERS customers via the web.

# Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

**Project Name:** Electronic Permitting

**Agency:** North Dakota Highway Patrol

**Business Unit/Program Area:** Permitting

**Project Sponsor:** Carrie Oswald

**Project Manager:** Brenda Bulawa

Project Objectives	Measurements	
	Met/ Not Met	Description
To have all permits available online through a web based system	Met	<b>DESCRIPTION:</b> By the end of the project 90% of all permits will be able to be obtained on-line  <b>RESULT: Between June 12, 2013 and October 2, 2013 55,369 permits were purchased, 95% of all permits were obtained through the on-line system.</b>
Reduce the current phone wait times because all permits will be able to be obtained on-line	Met	<b>DESCRIPTION:</b> 60 days after system implementation average call wait times will be reduced to 30 minutes or less  <b>RESULT: From June to September the average speed in which an initial call is answered by a permitting officer is 7 minutes.</b>
Reduce the amount of postage used by NDHP in mailing out permits	Met	<b>DESCRIPTION:</b> 6 months after the project is implemented the postage cost to mail out permits will reduce by 15%  <b>RESULT: 50% of Highway Patrol (HP) mailing costs come from the permitting office. In May the HP postage costs were \$1045.90, in September postage costs were \$372.93. The permitting office postage costs have decreased by 36% since the routing system has been implemented.</b>
To rewrite the PowerBuilder application into a web based system	Met	<b>DESCRIPTION:</b> After the system has been implemented the resources pool that will be able to operate and maintain the new technology will increase from three individuals to 20+ individuals  <b>RESULT: The Information Technology Department (ITD) resource pool has 20 people to support the application.</b>
Provide 24 x 7 automated submission for oversize motor carriers	Met	<b>DESCRIPTION:</b> 50% of oversize permits do not utilize the automated system. Six months after the project is implemented 75% of all permits will be submitted and processed by the online system  <b>RESULT: Between June 12, 2013 and October 2, 2013 55,369 permits were purchased, 95% of all permits were obtained through the online system.</b>
To provide the permitting office with the tools necessary to increase their efficiency in processing permits	Met	<b>DESCRIPTION:</b> Purchase, Configure, and Implement the COTS product  <b>RESULT: On July 7, 2012 the State of North Dakota (SOND) signed a Technology Services Contract with ProMiles Software Development Corporation. The NDHP implemented the COTS product on June 12, 2013.</b>

# Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

		<p><b>DESCRIPTION:</b> Currently 50% of all oversized automated submissions require a permit specialist review. Six months after the project is implemented specialists will only be reviewing 25% of automated submission</p> <p><b>RESULT: The day after implementation, 24% of routable permit submissions required a permit officer specialist review. After 3 months 22% percent of automated permit submissions required a permit officer specialist to review.</b></p> <p><b>DESCRIPTION:</b> With the automation there will no longer be a need to continue the contract for 2 Temporary staff members currently required to keep up with the work load</p> <p><b>RESULT: The permit office was able to return to normal staffing levels on July 1, 2013 with no temporary staff needed.</b></p>
To purchase a COTS product that will interact with the current receipt/permit system to verify height, weight and length of the load movement on state and federal roads	Met	<p><b>DESCRIPTION:</b> The NDHP will sign a contract with a vendor</p> <p><b>RESULT: On July 7, 2012 the SOND signed a Technology Services Contract with ProMiles Software Development Corporation to purchase, configure, and implement a Commercial off the Shelf (COTS) product.</b></p>

### Schedule Objectives

Met/ Not Met	Original Baseline Schedule (in Months)	Final Baseline Schedule (in Months)	Actual Schedule (in Months)	Variance to Original Baseline	Variance to Final Baseline
Met	25	25	25	0%	0%

### Budget Objectives

Met/ Not Met	Original Baseline Budget	Final Baseline Budget	Actual Costs	Variance to Original Baseline	Variance to Final Baseline
Met	\$2,560,000	\$2,560,000	1,824,842	29% Under	29% Under

### Major Scope Changes

- During the Enhanced Automated Routing the following new scope was added:
- Mobility – Make the ePermits application more user friendly when using mobile devices.
  - Portal – Create a single point of reference for information on permitting within the SOND; this includes information for counties and state permits.
  - Data Sharing –
    - To create a web interface between North Dakota Highway Patrol (NDHP) Permitting application and the permit application created and maintained by the Association of Oil and Gas Producing Counties. This interface allows a consumer to transfer their basic permit data to the county consortium ePermit system.
    - The original intent was to provide a bi-directional transfer of data between the Association of Oil and Gas county consortium. After analysis the project moved forward with only doing a single direction interface between the HP ePermits system with the Oil and Gas county consortium.

# Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

### Lessons Learned

- The ePermit project had several subprojects rolled into one; this created coordination challenges, and diluted focus and attention from the limited resources assigned to the project. The subprojects needed to be prioritized and the schedule adjusted to accommodate the challenges.
- The Executive Steering Committee brought experience and insight to the project benefiting the State of North Dakota.
- After selecting individuals for the procurement team a review of State Procurement Guidelines and discussion about their roles and responsibilities needed to occur.
- Do not make any vendor meetings 'required' during the procurement process as this could create a procurement issue.
- More time may have been needed for the creation of the Request for Proposal (RFP). The project had two BAFO exercises; maybe one could have been eliminated if the RFP had been more specific.
- The procurement team felt that doing a Request for Information (RFI) before the RFP would have assisted them in creating a better RFP.
- The procurement team members were asked to score the RFP responses; this was difficult for some, as this was outside their comfort area of expertise.
- In the RFP responses all vendors said they could meet our technical requirements. During vendor demonstrations representative of the technical scoring group should verify that the vendor has experience in working in this environment.
- When you have a project with a tight schedule setup tentative meeting times to ensure availability as resource time may be competing with day to day activity or other projects.
- A monthly newsletter providing status would have helped keep the project team Subject Matter Experts (SME's) more informed on current and upcoming events.
- All side-bar conversations and/or impromptu meetings should have a formal document created to ensure all details and decisions were captured.
- Members of the team felt that their roles and responsibilities identified in the project plan were to high level. Need to have a more granular document for everyone's roles and responsibilities.
- The PMO SharePoint site was in its infancy when the project started, having the flexibility to make changes to the template made it more efficient.
- Refresher training should be provided to SharePoint users throughout the project.
- The ITD Work Management System (WMS) should have been setup at the project start based on the phased project hours for the entire project not by multiple work orders.
- There were several problem logs identified during Receipt/Rewrite User Acceptance Testing the agency scenarios were not included in the logs. During Enhanced Automated Routing this improved making resolution time shorter.
- There was not enough Quality Assurance (QA) test cycles planned into the project schedule. More time needs to be allocated for testing.
- When designing reports a draft layout should be provided to the agency for review and signoff during the design phase of the project.
- Process documentation was limited in some areas, those areas should be identified and the information updated earlier in the project.
- This project was one of the first chosen to utilize the new QA process. The inclusion of QA extended the ITD schedule though no change was made to the overall project schedule.
- When doing an iterative phased project approach, include time and resources to go back and improve upon previously completed phases.
- When conducting usability testing the prototype should include all functionality as it is not a true test of usability.
- Ensure that all business process are documented, tasks should be included in the project to review, add, and update these processes. If this was done during analysis some possible process improvements could have been identified for design and development. During UAT the agency identified some process improvements these were documented for future enhancements.
- Due to the complexity of the project the development objects should have been reviewed and smaller iterations with fewer objects could have been done. This could have saved more time in

# Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

testing.

- Industry training went well; earlier marketing could have brought in more participants.
- Needed to allocate more time for internal training to enhance comfort level of users.
- Having detailed requirements will assist in limiting scope creep. Be prepared address and scope creep in a future enhancement.
- By doing an extensive risk analysis during planning could prevent major issues from occurring during the life of the project.
- When a COTS product is being implemented the vendor should always be onsite.

### Success Stories

- "Reduced workload for Bridge 50% and will reduce more if we incorporate..." - DOT
- "Bridge division has more time for Bridge Division work..." DOT
- Since implementation NDHP field troopers are writing 60% less permits in the field
- "System is fantastic. I utilize it daily and appreciate it." Sanjel Corporation
- "The new system is great, got a super load permit back right away." Transport Permits

# Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

**Project Name:** Workforce Safety and Insurance Information Technology Transformation Program (ITTP),  
Advanced Information Management Project (AIM)

**Agency:** Workforce Safety & Insurance (WSI)

**Business Unit/Program Area:** All

**Project Sponsor:** Clare Carlson

**Project Manager:** Doug Hintz

Objectives		
Project Objectives	Measurements	
	Met/ Not Met	Description
Achieve a 4% reduction in annual claims costs, which equates to \$3.4M annually subsequent to implementation of the new system.	Not Met	Project was terminated prior to completion (i.e. no portion of the iVOS software was implemented).
Provide 24/7 Internet or WEB access to employer accounts and claims information.	Not Met	Project was terminated prior to completion (i.e. no portion of the iVOS software was implemented).

Schedule Objectives					
Met/ Not Met	Original Baseline Schedule (in Months)	Final Baseline Schedule (in Months)	Actual Schedule (in Months)	Variance to Original Baseline	Variance to Final Baseline
Not Met	24	60.1	*N/A	200% Over	150.42% Over

**\*Project was terminated prior to completion (i.e. no portion of the iVOS software was implemented).**

The following two subprojects were successfully completed as part of the AIM project:

- Back-Scanning Project:** A back-scanning subproject, whereby almost 14,000 paper policy related documents were scanned and imaged for future electronic retrieval was completed ahead of schedule (by more than a month) and under budget by almost \$200,000 (Budget of \$415,756 and Actual costs of \$215,805).
- FileNet Enterprise Services Project:** In conjunction with the implementation of the iVOS software for claims and policy, a subproject was initiated to upgrade WSI's FileNet enterprise services (used for document management) to a newer version (FileNet P8) as well as assist with the integration of FileNet and iVOS. Initially, this upgrade to FileNet P8 was planned to occur simultaneously with the iVOS implementation of claims. However, after several delays in the iVOS implementation, a decision was made to complete this upgrade separate from the iVOS implementation and address the integration of FileNet and iVOS as needed. This upgrade was successfully completed on schedule and under budget (Budget of \$625,140 and Actual cost of \$575,520 due to a reduction in scope). In addition to the upgrade, a subsequent project, outside the scope of the AIM project, was completed whereby nearly 16 million documents were migrated to the FileNet P8 version. This was also completed on schedule and budget (cost of \$253,500).

Budget Objectives					
Met/ Not Met	Original Baseline Budget	Final Baseline Budget	Actual Costs	Variance to Original Baseline	Variance to Final Baseline
Not Met	\$12,813,171	\$17,813,289	*\$17,133,609	33.7% Over	3.8% Under

# Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

\*Project was terminated prior to completion (i.e. no portion of the iVOS software was implemented).

### Major Scope Changes

This table is provided to identify major scope activity along with impact to schedule and budget.

Date	SCOPE Change Description	Impact on Schedule	Impact on Cost	Source
Dec-07	Project began execution phase.	Initial baseline established; Dec. 2009	Initial baseline established; \$12,813,171	2007 Q4 LPO Report 2007 Q4 LPO Summary
Dec-07	Addition of an HCL resource to provide validation services for a pilot process prior to beginning the Business Analysis phase.	No impact to schedule	\$24,000 for HCL resource onsite for pilot period.	2007 Q4 LPO Report
Mar-08	Addition of Organizational Change Management services to the HCL contract.	No impact to schedule	\$405,000 funded from Management Reserve	2008 Q2 LPO Report HCL Contract History
Jul-08	Rework of "Utility Services" deliverables by HCL for WSI hosting services from ITD.	No impact to schedule	\$128,000	2008 Q3 LPO Report
Aug-08	Modify the method of pricing for iVOS Medical Bill Review processing from a per-bill charge to a one-time perpetual license agreement plus annual maintenance. While this is not technically a scope change, this decision was projected to reduce the operational costs associated with medical bill review functionality by \$1,000,000 or more over a 10 year period.	No impact to schedule	No Impact on cost; just a modification to payment terms.	2008 Q3 LPO Report Aon Contract History
Sep-08	Baseline of project schedule based on information gathered during business analysis and gap analysis activities. This rolling wave planning approach was agreed upon up front in the initial project plan.	Schedule baseline modified; March 2010 (Claims - Aug 2009; Policy - Mar 2010)	Cost baseline modified; \$12,850,783	2008 Q3 LPO Report 2008 Q3 LPO Summary
Oct-08	Addition of FileNet Enterprise Services from HCL required because there were no resources available at either ITD or WSI that could perform the required work to support FileNet work in the FileNet and Architecture plans for the iVOS implementation.	No impact to schedule	\$527,400 funded from project risk funding.	2008 Q4 LPO Report HCL Contract History
Dec-08	Additional data conversion to help decrease the risk in future data migration to iVOS production.	No impact to schedule	\$15,000 funded from project risk funding.	2008 Q4 LPO Report

# Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

Dec-08	Addition of Quality Assurance (QA) Testing Services from HCL to supplement and support WSI testing efforts; services contracted through Aug 2009.	No impact to schedule	\$300,000 funded from project risk funding.	2008 Q4 LPO Report HCL Contract History
Jan-09	FileNet certified technician required to perform FileNet Image Services installation in order to maintain support from IBM. (Vendor Pool WO with HCL)	No impact to schedule	\$3,000 funded from project risk funding.	2009 Q1 LPO Report HCL Contract History
Feb-09	Additional Employer Services files identified for back-scanning.	No impact to AIM schedule; increase of 3 weeks to back-scanning schedule.	\$11,400 funded from project risk funding for temp employees.	2009 Q1 LPO Report
Mar-09	Notice from Aon of potential delay in delivering technical designs and specifications for development. Revised project schedule approved. A schedule delay report with lessons learned and an impact analysis was delivered to large project oversight (LPO).	Schedule revised to June 2010 (Claims - Jan 2010; Policy - Jun 2010)	Revised Aon contract providing for 4 months of free maintenance & support following implementation, equal to \$160,000. Additional months of free M & S, up to a total of 12 months, if any further delays.	2009 Q1 LPO Report Aon Contract History
Aug-09	Extension and additional scope for the HCL FileNet Enterprise Services Contract due in part to the delay of the iVOS implementation.	Required (in part) to align with iVOS implementation schedule.	\$94,740	2009 Q3 LPO Report HCL Contract History
Aug-09	Extension of the HCL QA Testing Services through May 2010 due to the delay of the iVOS implementation.	Required to align with iVOS implementation schedule.	\$246,960	2009 Q3 LPO Report HCL Contract History
Sep-09	Extension of the PMO services from HCL through Sep 2010 due to delays in the iVOS implementation.	Required to align with iVOS implementation schedule.	\$872,400	2009 Q3 LPO Report HCL Contract History
Apr-10	Temporary suspension of remaining Organizational Change Management (OCM) services from HCL to coincide more closely with iVOS implementation.	No impact to schedule	No Impact on cost	2010 Q2 LPO Report
May-10	Extension of the HCL QA Testing Services through Dec 2010 due to the delay of the iVOS implementation.	Required to align with iVOS implementation schedule.	\$317,520	2010 Q2 LPO Report HCL Contract History
Jul-10	Amendment No. 7 to the Aon contract was signed; contract extended with the inclusion of the following: - \$950,000 - Cost of Change Control Requests - \$100,000 - Aon Travel Expenses	Schedule re-baselined to December 2012 (Claims - Jan 2012; Policy - Sep 2012; Project Closeout – Dec 2012).	Additional costs of \$2,676,768 associated with Aon Contract.	2010 Q3 LPO Report Aon Contract History

# Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

	- \$775,000 - Scheduled Payments (tied to specific deliverables) - \$851,768 - Monthly Payments (June 2010-Oct. 2012)			
Jul-10	Additional costs associated with the project (WSI, ITD, Intertech, other 3rd party) due to the extension of the Aon contract and project completion date of 4th quarter 2012).	Required to align with iVOS implementation schedule.	~\$1,500,000 from Jul 2010 through Dec 2012.	2010 Q3 LPO Report AIM Budget Projection worksheet
Sep-10	Extension of the PMO services from HCL through Jan 2012 due to delays in the iVOS implementation.	Required to align with iVOS implementation schedule.	\$900,000	2010 Q3 LPO Report HCL Contract History
Sep-10	Removal of remaining OCM services deliverables from HCL contract; determined that with delays in iVOS implementation, services were not needed.	No impact to schedule	Reduction of (\$197,656)	2010 Q3 LPO Report HCL Contract History
Nov-10	Addition of consulting services (Surepoint Consulting) to assist with the implementation of the Policy component of the project.	Intended to have a positive impact on schedule.	\$92,882 from Nov 2010 through Jul 2011.	AIM Budget Projection worksheet
Dec-10	Extension of the HCL QA Testing Services through Jan 2012 due to the delay of the iVOS implementation.	Required to align with iVOS implementation schedule.	\$458,640	2010 Q4 LPO Report HCL Contract History
Jan-11	Decision made to implement Mitchel's bill review system, SmartAdvisor, prior to iVOS implementation.			2011 Q1 LPO Report
Jan-11	Notification from Aon that around 50% of the functionality planned for the February 2011 software release would not be delivered until the next scheduled release (April 2011).	The claims implementation date of Jan 2012 is at risk of not being met.		2011 Q1 LPO Report
Mar-11	Notification from Aon that around 60% of the functionality planned for the April 2011 software release would not be delivered; the missed development from the Feb & Apr releases would be delivered in the July 2011 release.	The claims implementation date of Jan 2012 is severely at risk of not being met.		2011 Q1 LPO Report
Mar-11	There is no customization for policy planned to be delivered in the April 2011 software release.	The policy implementation date of Sep 2012 is at risk of not being met.		2011 Q1 LPO Report
Mar-11	Successful completion of FileNet P8 migration project.			2011 Q1 LPO Report
Jun-11	Delay in implementation of SmartAdvisor bill review due to			2011 Q2 LPO Report

# Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

	unresolved issues related to history bills, data migration and fee schedule and business rules.			
Jun-11	Addendum No. 1 to Amendment No. 7 of Aon contract signed, providing for financial concessions in the way of forfeited payments if implementation dates not met.	No impact on schedule but does provide for financial considerations if project schedule dates not met.	Potential of <b>(\$420,627)</b> in forfeited payments by Aon.	Aon Contract History
Aug-11	High volume of customizations received in August 2011 release but also high number of defects.			2011 Q3 LPO Report
Sep-11	Began withholding payments to Aon due to inadequate quality of deliverables.		Total withheld payments from Sep 2011 through Dec 2012 amounted to <b>(\$450,434)</b> .	AIM Budget Projection worksheet
Sep-11	Projected project completion dates provided to ESC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Manual projection using MS Project &amp; ROM estimates show Claims implementation from May to July 2012 and Policy implementation from October 2012 to February 2013.</li> <li>- Projection using the project variance worksheet shows a project estimated end date of June 2014.</li> </ul>	According to projections, project would be delayed by as much as 18 months beyond the latest baseline date of Dec 2012.	For each month of delay beyond the latest baseline of Dec 2012, there would be additional costs associated with HCL, Intertech, and other 3rd party contracts, as well as addition costs associated with ITD support.	2011 Q3 LPO Report
Oct-11	Five new Change Control Requests (CCRs) were approved for Claims implementation.	Not anticipated to adversely impact the claims go-live schedule beyond issues already identified.	Cost of the CCRs is covered in the allocation of \$950,000 for CCRs that was included in Amendment No. 7 to the Aon Contract.	2011 Q4 LPO Report
Jan-12	Per stipulations in Addendum No. 1 to Amendment No. 7 of the Aon contract, Aon began forfeiting payments.		Total of <b>(\$420,627)</b> in forfeited payments by Aon from Jan through Dec 2012.	AIM Budget Projection worksheet
Jan-12	Extension of the PMO services from HCL through Aug 2012 due to delays in the iVOS implementation.	Required to align with iVOS implementation schedule.	\$196,875	2012 Q1 LPO Report HCL Contract History
Jan-12	Extension of the HCL QA Testing Services through Aug 2012 due to the delay of the iVOS implementation.	Required to align with iVOS implementation schedule.	\$246,960	2012 Q1 LPO Report HCL Contract History
Feb-12	Two new Change Control Requests (CCRs) were approved for Claims implementation.	Not anticipated to adversely impact the claims go-live schedule beyond issues already identified.	Cost of the CCRs is covered in the allocation of \$950,000 for CCRs that was included in Amendment No. 7 to the Aon Contract.	2012 Q1 LPO Report
Apr-12	One new Change Control Requests (CCR) was approved for	Not anticipated to adversely impact the	Cost of the CCRs is covered in the allocation	2012 Q2 LPO

# Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

	Claims implementation.	claims go-live schedule beyond issues already identified.	of \$950,000 for CCRs that was included in Amendment No. 7 to the Aon Contract.	Report
Jun-12	Although no new baselines have been accepted /approved, current estimated target date for Claims go-live is Sep 2012 and all activity on Policy implementation has been put on hold in order to concentrate efforts on Claims.	Although not officially approved, Sep 2012 set as target go-live date for Claims.		2012 Q2 LPO Report
Sep-12	Discussions between WSI & Aon regarding de-scoping Policy from the project/contract. The Aon contract terminated before any final negotiations were reached.	All future efforts would be concentrated on Claims.	Would equate to a cost reduction of <b>(\$588,680)</b> for Policy deliverables not received yet and potential for recovery of part or all of Policy deliverable payments already made to Aon, <b>(\$693,384)</b> and other 3rd parties <b>(\$612,842)</b> .	2012 Q2 LPO Report Aon Contract Summary worksheet
Sep-12	Claims go-live date of Sep 2012 was not achieved.	Needs to be determined.	Unknown; to be determined based on schedule.	2012 Q3 LPO Report
Oct-12	McGladrey external audit report completed and presented to WSI executive staff. Purpose of audit was to determine the viability of the claims portion of the iVOS implementation project, as well as provide an estimated total cost and timeline to complete the project.	According to McGladrey's assessment, implementation of the claims portion of the project would take an additional 16 to 22 months to complete; extending project completion to between Feb and Jul 2014.	According to McGladrey's assessment the additional 16 to 22 months to complete the claims portion of the project would incur additional costs of between \$1,970,280 and \$2,664,510	2012 Q4 LPO Report McGladrey WSI iVOS Assessment - Final Executive Summary Report
Dec-12	Aon contract expired; notice sent to Aon that contract would not be extended.	Project suspended.		2012 Q4 LPO Report Aon Contract
Feb-13	By approval of the ESC, the following direction was provided: "Prior to and in preparation of a procurement we (WSI) complete the following steps and make decisions on the next steps based upon the results of these efforts." i. Perform lessons learned ii. Develop a new project charter iii. Perform market research iv. Perform architecture review v. Review requirements vi. Review business processes			2013 Q1 LPO Report ESC / EOPC Meeting Minutes from 02/27/2013
May-13	By unanimous decision of the ESC, the current ITTP / AIM project will be closed out upon completion of the "lessons learned" effort and a new project	Project will be closed.	Costs to complete the lessons learned - \$19,733	2013 Q2 LPO Report ESC Meeting Minutes from

# Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

	will be initiated according to a new project charter.			05/07/2013
Nov-13	The ESC accepts the final report of lessons learned and agrees it meets the requirements of the WSI legislative appropriation bill.	Final requirement for closing out the project.		ESC Meeting Minutes from 11/21/2013
Dec-13	Post Implementation Report and Project Closeout Report completed. Project Closeout Report presented to SITAC and Interim Legislative IT Committee.	Project closed.		Post Implementation Report Project Closeout Report

### Lessons Learned

A comprehensive "lessons learned" analysis was conducted on the project with the intent of identifying the good things that were done in the project so they may be repeated, and identifying those things that can be changed or improved upon with the goal of WSI having the best opportunity for success in the next project. The following are the top 10 lessons identified along with a summary of the impact they may have on future project work. For complete detail, findings and recommendations, please refer to the "Lessons Learned from the North Dakota Workforce Safety & Insurance Information Technology Transformation Program's Advanced Information Management Project" ("**Lessons Learned Report**") report.

**Lesson:** Manage vendor contracts to the letter, from the start of the engagement, while leveraging the experts available in procurement, legal, finance, IT and project management during negotiations and as soon as issues start to arise.

**Impact:** Managing contracts to the exact specifications defined in the contract and taking swift action when a breach occurs can limit potential losses in cases where vendor expertise or commitment proves lacking. Over the past three years state staff has gained significant experience in procurement practices, negotiation, and contract management. Leveraging those resources will help WSI apply the latest strategies for success.

**Lesson:** For large projects, require full-time onsite commitment of some vendor resources.

**Impact:** Requiring the provision of full-time onsite personnel can provide enforceability of the vendor's stated resource commitment and maximize communication and timeliness of feedback. The average response time for e-mail in 2012 was 2.5 days, an increase of 14% over the previous year. There is only a 56% chance someone will answer an email within an hour and 89% chance they will answer it within 24 hours. (Barr, 2013) Voice mail is even worse with more than 30 percent of voice mail messages remaining unheard for three days or longer. (Teitell, 2009) These inherent delays in communications can quickly start causing project delays. By having key staff on site throughout the project and bringing in additional SMEs ["Subject Matter Experts"] as needed, WSI can minimize delays caused by communication.

**Lesson:** Assign project management responsibility for large IT projects to a qualified Project Management Professional (PMP)<sup>®</sup> credentialed project manager with ND large IT project experience, providing unfettered access to project sponsors and executive leadership to ensure the use of the state's methodology.

**Impact:** Assigning a PMP- credentialed project manager as primary PM provides WSI an assurance that this key position has both knowledge of project management principles and a minimum of 4500 hours of experience. In addition the certification requires continuing education to remain certified so the PM can assure WSI that his/her skills have remained fresh. The state qualifications ensure the PM understands the unique requirements placed upon WSI by North Dakota Century Code.

By providing unfettered access to executive sponsorship and final authority over official project communications, WSI can help ensure neutrality and transparency in the face of day-to-day organizational pressures and politics.

**Lesson:** Leverage the ESC for the expertise they have gained from projects across all agencies and to share responsibility in difficult decisions.

**Impact:** Part of the value [Executive Order 2011-20](#) and recent legislation ([N.D.C.C. § 54-59-32](#)) has provided is the assignment of key personnel to sit on ESCs across multiple agencies. This provides experience unparalleled in any single agency. Leveraging these ESC members' expertise can help prevent the need for an agency to go it alone in facing

# Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

complex project issues, allowing WSI to utilize the knowledge gained in other large state IT projects.

**Lesson:** Invest in mapping and reorganizing of granular business processes at the onset of the project, basing project objectives on them and providing success criteria on enabling of those processes in early stage gates.

**Impact:** Having business process documentation generated before trying to obtain and implement a solution can provide objectivity during project execution. This documentation can help management separate legitimate concerns raised by business from negativity born of resistance to change or other subjective reasons. It also provides WSI with clear measurement points to validate the vendor's solution early and often. WSI will be better equipped to determine if they need to cancel a project much earlier in the project timeline.

**Lesson:** Formulate an Organizational Change Management strategy and provide early and consistent communication of change on all levels.

**Impact:** One of the classic failures of an IT project is the successful implementation of a software product that no one uses. Organizational Change Management efforts help ensure the vision for the project is unified, that staff are ready for change; that resistance is managed effectively and proactively, and that everyone knows how they will accomplish their job in the new environment.

**Lesson:** Executives: Be transparent and involved leaders during projects through increased daily contact with team members and the timely sharing of information, both inside and outside the agency.

**Impact:** Ongoing face-to-face involvement from executive leadership with stakeholders at all levels of a project can help maintain trust, direction, and morale even when opinions on direction may otherwise diverge. Executive leadership must show that they are hearing the business staff's opinions while also taking the responsibility for making decisions, selling those decisions throughout the organization, and setting the expectation that WSI staff will support those decisions. Involvement that is direct and personal provides the best chance for harmonizing these goals.

**Lesson:** While fostering a culture within the project in which contrary views can be voiced, insist that such views be presented respectfully and with objective reasons. Deal immediately and consistently with behavior that crosses into the realm of obstructive or unprofessional. Remove repeat offenders from project roles to prevent damage to morale and objectives.

**Impact:** One of the core skills taught in a facilitation course is how to handle dysfunctional behavior. If it is not addressed, dysfunctional behavior tends to get worse over time. Left unchecked, it can spread to other members of the group. Generally, some form of disagreement is the basis for dysfunctional behavior. There are three reasons people tend to disagree.

- Level 1. Each has not clearly heard and understood the alternative and/or the reason for the alternative
- Level 2. Each has heard and understood the alternative, but has different experiences or holds different values that result in a different preference
- Level 3. Disagreement is based on personality, past history, or other factors that have nothing to do with the topic at hand (The Effective Facilitator, 1999)

By fostering an environment that allows people to fully discuss their concerns and issues, WSI can avoid most disagreements. By addressing the higher-level disagreement quickly WSI can minimize dysfunctional behavior and prevent the behavior from spreading to other project members.

**Lesson:** Allow additional lead-time for planning and fulfillment of project resource needs in recognition of growing agency demands. Plan and budget for temporary staff to fill low-level positions to allow more experienced staff to step up to fill gaps left by people assigned to the project.

**Impact:** Estimating and analyzing expected resource allocation requirements for internal WSI staffing prior to product acquisition and execution can help the agency devise strategies to manage the strain of the project implementation.

One key strategy should be to plan for temporary staff to help fill gaps. This may require more than a one-for-one replacement to overcome lower efficiencies. WSI should bring the temporary staff on-board prior to project staff leaving in order to cover the training period

**Lesson:** Avoid solutions involving significant modification of COTS products as such approaches signal a likely mismatch to needs.

**Impact:** Solutions to project requirements that are dependent upon significant modification of commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) software are a red flag indicator of a potential mismatch with needs. Rather, WSI should make the selection of COTS solutions with the assumption that business units will need to modify their processes to fit the software. A key part of

# Project Closeout Report

## Presented to the IT Committee December 10, 2013

that analysis is identifying what functionality the business units would lose in a proposed system. Otherwise, WSI should consider a custom-developed solution or an approach involving customization of a framework intended for such modification.

### Success Stories

A back-scanning subproject, whereby almost 14,000 paper policy related documents were scanned and imaged for future electronic retrieval was completed providing for easy access to these documents in the future.

FileNet enterprise services used throughout WSI for document management of nearly all of WSI's documents, was upgraded to a current version of FileNet (P8), including the migration of nearly 16 million documents from the old version of FileNet (IS) to P8.

Claims and Policy processes were documented in detail in preparation for implementing iVOS. Even though the iVOS implementation was not successful, the documentation that was produced should be of considerable value in completing business process modeling going forward.