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Overall the project seems to be making good progress despite initial challenges in some areas – most specifically, vendor management. IV&V is hopeful that the replacement of two SI PM resources will address some of these challenges, and will continue monitoring activities as appropriate. Discovery phase concerns continued to persist during this reporting period, and IV&V would encourage the SI to develop mitigation strategies to address this, as well as other concerns identified in the IV&V report(s) on a timely basis to promote project success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan 18</th>
<th>Process Areas</th>
<th>IV&amp;V Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor Project Management</td>
<td>IV&amp;V continues to track 10 risks/observations specific to this process area but is hopeful, with the replacement of 2 SI PM resources, these risks will be mitigated. With these additions, project roles and responsibilities should be clearly defined by the SI. While the project seems to be on track, some of these risks could pose a threat to project success and software quality primarily due to a less-than optimal discovery phase, the lack of clarity around the SI's SDLC processes and the SI's lack of attention to risk management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements Management</td>
<td>IV&amp;V’s main concern is over the lack of a clearly established governance process in accordance with best practices to manage requirements &amp; user stories using the Project’s ALM tool (TFS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and Development</td>
<td>Development has yet to begin, however IV&amp;V has concerns over the SI's planned use of a custom accelerator, and the tendency of the SI team to steer BHA towards existing functionality without careful analysis of functionality that may be specific to BHA’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Change Management</td>
<td>IV&amp;V remains concerned with the SI's apparent lack of attention to user adoption and that the SI does not plan to elicit, track and leverage the use of business process pain points, which could negatively impact OCM effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of this reporting period, PCG has identified a total of 21 findings (18 risks and 3 observations). Of the open risks, 10 are related to Vendor Project Management. One risk and 2 observations were added during this reporting period, and 4 risks that were opened during the previous reporting period were closed. The following graphs breakdown the risks by type, status, and priority/criticality.
The activities that PCG performed to inform the IV&V report for the current period are listed below. Upcoming activities are also included. For specifics, see Appendix B – Inputs.

• IV&V activities performed during the reporting period:
  1. Attended Data Migration meeting
  2. Attended Schedule and Scope Planning meetings
  3. Attended Design/Solution/Estimate Review Meetings
  4. Attended weekly SI project status meetings
  5. Attended Project Steering Committee meeting
  6. Attended User Story Review Sessions
  7. Facilitated IV&V Monthly Report review meetings
  8. Attended other strategy & analysis meetings
  9. Reviewed Architectural Blueprint deliverable

• IV&V activities planned for the upcoming reporting period:
  1. Attend weekly SI project status and analysis meetings
  2. Attend other strategy & analysis meetings as needed
  3. Attend bi-weekly IV&V meeting
  4. Review project deliverables
  5. Prepare/review IV&V Monthly Report
  6. Attend Project Steering Committee meeting
IV&V Findings and Recommendations

Process Areas Reviewed

Throughout this project, IV&V will verify and validate activities performed in the following process areas. Those areas that were reviewed during the current period are asterisked below:

- Vendor Project Management*
- Requirements Management*
- Design and Development*
- Testing
- Data Management
- Organizational Change Management*

* Indicates process area addressed in this report
## IV&V Findings and Recommendations

### Vendor Project Management

#### Key Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Unclear risk management processes (#22) <em>(New observation!)</em></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SME participation challenges (#11)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unclear review and approval process for project deliverables (#16)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SI resource turnover (#17)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Best Practices

- Executive stakeholder buy-in, participation and support continue to exist throughout the Project
- The Project Management Plan is developed, maintained, and followed throughout the Project
- Project reporting clearly communicates project status to the project management team and key stakeholders

#### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Meet with SI Executive Management to address these concerns during the transition to the new PM/Lead Analyst and track progress as part of separate but regular engagement manager meetings with the BHA</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Request SI improve resource turnover by implementing recommendations from findings log</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommend the SI make every effort to stimulate state SME engagement in future discussions</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommend BHA request the SI clarify and follow an agreed upon acceptance and sign-off process</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV&V is currently tracking 10 vendor project management risks/observations and closed 4 during this reporting period. IV&V is hopeful, with the SI’s replacement of 2 PM resources, that several project management risks will be quickly addressed and mitigated and has therefore closed some risks (#4, #8, #10, #13) mostly associated with the previous SI PM/Lead Analyst. IV&V will continue to monitor for the residual effects of these and other risks that have resulted in a sub-optimal discovery phase as these could, if not managed well, have long-term impacts to the quality of the project and project deliverables.

IV&V remains concerned over SME participation and the related impact on user adoption as well as the effects of SI staff turnover. PCG will continue to monitor these and related risks in future reporting periods to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.

IV&V has opened a new observation (#20) regarding the lack of a clear, disciplined risk management process due to risk log inconsistencies as well as a Risk Management Plan that offers few process details to ensure that risks are identified, tracked and mitigated on a timely basis.
### IV&V Findings and Recommendations

#### Vendor Project Management, cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Non-agile (or unclear) SDLC (#1)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long Iteration cycles (#2)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of attention to process improvement (#3)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Late-game analysis of requirements awaiting details from external sources (#5)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SI does not plan to assist with identifying/tracking pain points (#6)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SI does not plan to fully log/track out-of-scope requirements (#15)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BHA SME’s competing priorities could hinder their ability to effectively complete project tasks (#18)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Best Practices

- Executive stakeholder buy-in, participation and support continue to exist throughout the Project
- The Project Management Plan is developed, maintained, and followed throughout the Project
- Project reporting clearly communicate project status to the project management team and key stakeholders

#### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Request project methodology clarification and agreement on strategic application of Agile principles</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Request SI address risks associated with longer iterations/sprints</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agree on best utilization of pain points list</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Request late game analysis on a select list of requirements awaiting details from external sources</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Request the SI track out of scope requirements</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitor BHA SME capacity and communicate expectations clearly</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IV&V Findings and Recommendations

### Vendor Project Management Findings Discussion, cont’d.

#### Non-agile (or unclear) SDLC

The SI is pursuing what they call a ‘WaterScrumFall’ methodology, which seems to be a mixture of Agile and waterfall methods however, there seems to be some confusion over which aspects of Agile the SI will employ.

The BHA’s stated project objectives include a desire for rapid development, interactive/collaborative design (focus on the user), adaptability to change, predictable delivery and schedules, and short sprint cycles. There are several benefits to utilizing agile methods, typically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High product quality</td>
<td>Greater transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher customer satisfaction</td>
<td>Early and predictable delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased project control</td>
<td>Allows for change (embraces change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced risks (better risk management)</td>
<td>Focuses on business value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faster ROI</td>
<td>Focuses on users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>Identifies problems early</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Failure to leverage aspects of Agile could lead to a loss in some or all of these benefits. Additionally, failure to provide the Project with a clear, consistent message regarding the Project’s methodology can create confusion and frustration for BHA leadership and other members of the team as well as make it difficult for leadership to plan for future activities. Other concerns regarding WaterScrumFall include long iteration cycles (initially 8-14 weeks, now 6 weeks), when 2-3 weeks are typical for most Agile projects.

Though the specific requirement for Agile has been removed from the executed BHA/RSM contract, IV&V recommends BHA request a meeting with the SI (as well as methodology documentation) to discuss, clarify, and agree upon a project methodology and seek to apply Agile principles to the project, as appropriate. Once an agreement is documented and agreed upon, IV&V will continue to monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.
### Other SDLC Risks

In general, the SI has demonstrated a good deal of knowledge of BHA business processes and has effectively leveraged their knowledge of similar projects from other states as well as the Dynamics CRM platform to speed analysis discussions. IV&V remains concerned with analysis techniques that seem to lack depth and avoid delving into opportunities for process improvement, which could lead to a ‘to-be’ design that simply automates existing processes rather than improve them. The discovery phase is a prime opportunity for capturing worker pain points and process improvements as well as out-of-scope business needs, all the while stimulating SME/user buy-in and adoption. Now that discovery is complete and user stories are scheduled for approval, some of these opportunities have been lost, however, BHA has indicated that individual SI analyst efforts during user story approval seems to have made up for some of the lack of analysis depth during discovery. IV&V will continue to monitor impacts to the quality of user stories, user adoption, and system design.
IV&V Findings and Recommendations

Requirements Management

Key Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
<th>Critical Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of good TFS governance (#20) <em>(New risk!)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tracking of requirement elaborations (#14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best Practices

- The RTM includes traceability throughout design, code, and test phases
- Analysis is performed to verify that the system requirements meet federal and state regulations, requirements and objectives
- Major stakeholders and users are consulted and involved in the activities related to system functionality and the user interface

Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Request SI provide better guidance in advance for BHA project activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not started</td>
<td>Request SI develop effective TFS governance and engage TFS experts to assist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not started</td>
<td>Request SI define and employ a process for requirement elaboration tracking and approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV&V remains concerned that the SI's TFS governance has not been clearly established. Failure to establish effective TFS governance can lead to ineffective/inefficient use of TFS throughout the project and poor requirements management. Reactive changes to TFS governance, when weaknesses are realized, can incur significant rework and cause confusion amongst the project team.

IV&V also remains concerned that requirements elaboration (i.e. the formalization of scope changes based on agreements between the SI and BHA) is not currently tracked in TFS. TFS governance is slated to be documented in the Configuration Management Plan which is currently being developed by the SI. IV&V will review this deliverable once it's available and continue to monitor for efficient, well planned requirements management and expert use of TFS.
### IV&V Findings and Recommendations

#### Design and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Use of accelerator (#12)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Architecture Blueprint deficiencies (#21)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Best Practices

- The system design is viable, based on scalability, maintainability, completeness and efficiency
- The proposed technical architecture is able to scale up to meet future workload and performance criteria
- The technical architecture is easily adaptable to new or changes in application requirements
- The solution supports federal MITA-alignment requirements

#### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Request the SI identify strategies and activities to mitigate typical issues/problems/risks associated with the use of accelerators.</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommend BHA ask the SI to document sufficient design details in the architectural blueprint document and ask that content focus on what the SI will do as opposed to what the products/platform can do.</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV&V Findings and Recommendations

Design and Development Discussion

Use of accelerator

IV&V has some initial concerns with the SI’s use of their accelerator (Dynamics CRM custom screens/workflows/code repurposed from the SI’s work in other states). Primarily, it appears that the SI has at times been remiss to suggest design concepts that don’t align with the existing functionality of their accelerator. Failure to optimize the system to meet BHA specific needs can lead to a system that is less than optimal/productive and require BHA users to employ workarounds and lengthy processes to achieve system tasks. The risks around employing the RSM accelerator are still unclear, however, use of accelerators, in general, have been known to be difficult to modify and maintain due to:

• Added complexity
• Interactions with accelerator could introduce bugs
• Bugs could occur that are not easy to track down because they’re buried in the complex functionality of the accelerator
• Removal of any component that’s not needed can cause unforeseen interactions or complications (i.e. may break other things)

Recommend BHA request the SI identify strategies and activities to mitigate typical issues/problems/risks associated with the use of accelerators. Once strategies are identified, IV&V will continue to monitor throughout the development phase their effectiveness and identify instances where this risk has been realized.

IV&V reviewed the SI’s draft Architecture Blueprint deliverable during this reporting period and observed that the document seems to be missing key information. Specific observations have been documented on PCG’s Document Comment Form (DCF) that was delivered to DOH on 2/23/18. IV&V looks forward to reviewing the SI’s updated deliverable that will address our concerns.
**IV&V Findings and Recommendations**

**Organizational Change Management**

**Key Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Minimal concern for User adoption (buy-in) (#7)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inadequate effort to elicit / track pain points (#6)</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best Practices**

• An Organizational Change Management (OCM) Plan is developed

• The OCM Plan addresses the integration of individual change management and organizational change management to ensure the achievement of business results.

• The OCM Plan includes steps to assess the level of change that will be required to determine the appropriate change management techniques that will be required.

**Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Request the SI adopt a general user adoption strategy (not a formal deliverable)</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agree on a process for how the SI will utilize the pain point list created by BHA</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Change Management Discussion

User adoption (buy-in)

IV&V continues to be concerned that the SI seems to lack a strategy to support user adoption. Agile methods typically focus on solving real problems and employ methods to allow the users to provide timely (typically with shorter sprints) feedback to ensure that the business problems are being solved.

The state has initiated the practice of tracking pain points. However, the process for how the SI will utilize this list needs to be clearly identified and monitored. Tracking pain points can be an effective OCM strategy for user adoption and buy-in as it provides visibility to the users of problems the system is actually solving and provides traceability of pain points to system features during sprint demos. Failure to track pain points and business problems can lead to a final product that fails to provide maximum value to the users.

The above risks combined with other related risks (#3 - Process Improvement, #11 – SME Participation) could negatively impact the overall user adoption and OCM strategy and, in the end, lead to a reduction of ongoing project funding, a weakened SI reputation, and public scrutiny.

Recommend BHA request the SI adopt a general user adoption strategy (not a formal deliverable) as well as an approach to leverage SME pain points and closely track business pain points throughout the project. IVV also recommends that the project’s OCM strategy address/incorporate pain points to show users that the system is solving real business problems which should lead to increased adoption rates.
Appendix A – Findings and Recommendations Log

This appendix provides the details of each finding and recommendation identified by IV&V. Project stakeholders are encouraged to review the findings and recommendations log details as needed.

- See Findings and Recommendations Log
- See Criticality Ratings provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>A high rating is assigned if there is a possibility of substantial impact to product quality, scope, cost, or schedule. A major disruption is likely and the consequences would be unacceptable. A different approach is required. Mitigation strategies should be evaluated and acted upon immediately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>A medium rating is assigned if there is a possibility of moderate impact to product quality, scope, cost, or schedule. Some disruption is likely and a different approach may be required. Mitigation strategies should be implemented as soon as feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>A low rating is assigned if there is a possibility of slight impact to product quality, scope, cost, or schedule. Minimal disruption is likely and some oversight is most likely needed to ensure that the risk remains low. Mitigation strategies should be considered for implementation when possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Inputs

This appendix identifies the artifacts and activities that serve as the basis for the IV&V observations.

Meetings attended during the reporting period:

1. Weekly SI project status meetings (2/5/18 – 2/12/18)
2. Budget/Deliverable discussion meetings
3. BHA IV&V Monthly Report review meeting
4. IV&V Deliverables Review meetings
5. BHA/RSM IV&V Monthly Report review meeting
6. Data Migration meeting
7. Schedule and Scope Planning meetings
8. Design/Solution/Estimate Review Meetings
9. RSM project management/IV&V touch base meeting
10. Project Steering Committee meeting

Artifacts reviewed during the reporting period:

1. Draft SI Project Management Plan and Testing Strategy
2. Updated Project Management Plan and Testing Strategy
3. Revised SI deliverables schedule
4. SI multi-release worksheet
5. DOH deliverables, year 1 – 3
6. Executed SI contract
7. SI Architectural Blueprint deliverable

Eclipse IV&V® Base Standards and Checklists
The SI has chosen to employ long iteration cycles.

## Agile Development

### Process Improvement

#### 3/1/18
- SI has indicated that they have removed the requirement for an agile implementation from the finalized BHA SI project contract. The work “Agile” has been replaced with “Iterative” throughout. The SI has provided additional methodology details which give IV&V a better understanding of the SI’s methodology. However, the SI seems to lack comprehensive methodology documentation so IV&V will continue to monitor to assure desired benefits of Agile are realized.

#### 2/16/18
- BHA detailed related concerns in an email to RSM.
- SI analysis seems to continue to lack appropriate depth.
- SI provided additional methodology details which has given IV&V a better understanding of the SI’s methodology and the rationale for new iteration cycles.

#### 2/23/18
- Unclear if progress has been made towards implementing the suggested iteration cycles. There have been several points and improvement opportunities that are reviewed with SMEs regularly to help identify potential process improvements.

#### 3/2/18
- BHA has indicated that they have removed the requirement for an agile implementation from the finalized BHA SI project contract. The work “Agile” has been replaced with “Iterative” throughout. The SI has provided additional methodology details which give IV&V a better understanding of the SI’s methodology. However, the SI seems to lack comprehensive methodology documentation so IV&V will continue to monitor to assure desired benefits of Agile are realized.

#### 9/1/17: SI continues to avoid questioning the necessity of making CRM CRM changes and requests SI provide greater detail around their to-be analysis methods.

#### 1/25/18: BHA detailed related concerns in an email to RSM.
- SI analysis seems to continue to lack appropriate depth.
- SI provided additional methodology details which has given IV&V a better understanding of the SI’s methodology and the rationale for new iteration cycles.

#### 3/1/18
- BHA has indicated that individual efforts by SI analysts during user story approval seems to have made up for some of the lack of analysis depth during the discovery phase.

#### 3/2/18
- SI has provided additional methodology details which has given IV&V a better understanding of the SI’s methodology and the rationale for new iteration cycles.

#### 3/3/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 3/19/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 3/22/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 3/29/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 4/5/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 4/12/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 4/19/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 4/26/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 5/3/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 5/10/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 5/17/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 5/24/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 6/7/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 6/14/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 6/21/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 7/5/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 7/12/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 7/19/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 7/26/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 8/2/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 8/9/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 8/16/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 8/23/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.

#### 9/1/18
- SI has continued to avoid making iterative improvements during future activities.
IV&V has not observed lack of receptiveness since the Minimal concern for IV&V has not observed lack of preparation since the
Closed Medium IV&V has observed the SI PM/Lead Analyst has not been Lack of preparation
Pain points Low SI seems more willing to utilize visual tools.
Medium Late game analysis
3/2/18: The SI view seems to be that this risk should be addressed as part of OCM which is outside the scope of their contract. IV&V has explained that opportunities to increase adoption can occur throughout the SI and it is the responsibility of the OCM team to incorporate these opportunities in the project plan. 3/2/18: If the SI is unable to respond to whiteboard requests, BHA may request a different tool be used. 2/15/18: SI has released a new plan and presented to BHA a xRM site for BHA to use. In summary, the SI view is that the system is solving real business problems and therefore increase adoption rates. Since an agreement is reached, IV&V will continue to work to ensure that the SI’s expectations are met.

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders can diminish the effectiveness of the system rollout, refusal to participate in the development/rollout process,
resistance to provide maximum value to the users. Failure to succinctly document, track, and monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.

On the one hand, this could lead to a reduction of ongoing project funding, a weakened SI reputation, and public scrutiny and criticism. On the other hand, this could lead to a reduction of ongoing project funding, a weakened SI reputation, and public scrutiny and criticism.

The SI view is that the system is solving real business problems and therefore increase adoption rates. Since an agreement is reached, IV&V will continue to work to ensure that the SI’s expectations are met.

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders can diminish the effectiveness of the system rollout, refusal to participate in the development/rollout process,
resistance to provide maximum value to the users. Failure to succinctly document, track, and monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders can diminish the effectiveness of the system rollout, refusal to participate in the development/rollout process,
resistance to provide maximum value to the users. Failure to succinctly document, track, and monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders can diminish the effectiveness of the system rollout, refusal to participate in the development/rollout process,
resistance to provide maximum value to the users. Failure to succinctly document, track, and monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders can diminish the effectiveness of the system rollout, refusal to participate in the development/rollout process,
resistance to provide maximum value to the users. Failure to succinctly document, track, and monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders can diminish the effectiveness of the system rollout, refusal to participate in the development/rollout process,
resistance to provide maximum value to the users. Failure to succinctly document, track, and monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders can diminish the effectiveness of the system rollout, refusal to participate in the development/rollout process,
resistance to provide maximum value to the users. Failure to succinctly document, track, and monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders can diminish the effectiveness of the system rollout, refusal to participate in the development/rollout process,
resistance to provide maximum value to the users. Failure to succinctly document, track, and monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders can diminish the effectiveness of the system rollout, refusal to participate in the development/rollout process,
resistance to provide maximum value to the users. Failure to succinctly document, track, and monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders can diminish the effectiveness of the system rollout, refusal to participate in the development/rollout process,
resistance to provide maximum value to the users. Failure to succinctly document, track, and monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders can diminish the effectiveness of the system rollout, refusal to participate in the development/rollout process,
resistance to provide maximum value to the users. Failure to succinctly document, track, and monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders can diminish the effectiveness of the system rollout, refusal to participate in the development/rollout process,
resistance to provide maximum value to the users. Failure to succinctly document, track, and monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.

Failure to effectively engage stakeholders can diminish the effectiveness of the system rollout, refusal to participate in the development/rollout process,
resistance to provide maximum value to the users. Failure to succinctly document, track, and monitor to validate that the BHA’s expectations are met.
Low
Open
Use of accelerator

Low
Open

09/02/17
Low
Open

SI has delivered the Project Management Plan (including opportunities, and user stories is below BHA expectations. The SI logging of out-of-scope requirements, improvement efforts, and BHA realization of the right SMEs have not shown up. At times it seems like the SI is remiss to suggest design concepts that don't align with the existing functionality of their accelerator. Additionally, it often seems like there is a need to suggest design concepts that don't align with the existing functionality of an acceptance process and has stated they will continue to monitor throughout the development process to validate that BHA's expectations are met.

Recommend BHA request SI engage TFS experts who can provide technical user story approval, and unnecessary rework for BHA resources whose capacity is already constrained. Failure to establish effective TFS governance can lead to significant confusion and loss of governance. Once strategies are identified, IVV will continue to monitor throughout the development process to validate that BHA's expectations are met.

Recommend BHA request SI base design decision on what's best suited for BHA and not on what issues/problems/risks associated with the use of accelerators. Recommend BHA request the SI identify strategies and activities to mitigate typical complications (may break other things in the accelerator) and focus on primarily on TFS governance. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend BHA request SI provide detailed information on what's being provided at a point in the project when it is urgently needed. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend BHA request SI engage TFS experts who can provide technical elaborations, but it seems they are doing it outside of TFS. The SI seems unclear about BHA's expectations for user story approval and has stated they will continue to monitor throughout the development process to validate that BHA's expectations are met.

Recommend the SI make efforts to conduct meetings in manner that engages the SME's continue to prefer to call-in to meetings instead of correct SME's seem to be in attendance. However, some SME's continue to refrain from attending in person. SI has observed that some SME's could not make meetings and provide little to no input. Correct SME's seem to be in attendance. However, some SME's continue to refrain from attending in person. SI has observed that some SME's could not make meetings and provide little to no input. SI will continue to monitor for full participation including SME's in person attendance at project meetings.

Recommend BHA request SI define and employ a process for requirement elaboration tracking and approval in TFS. IVV will continue to monitor to validate that the BHA's expectations are met.

Recommend BHA request SI clarify and follow an agreed upon acceptance and review process and have stated they will continue to monitor throughout the development process to validate that BHA's expectations are met.

Recommend BHA request SI engage TFS experts who can provide technical elaborations, but it seems they are doing it outside of TFS. The SI seems unclear about BHA's expectations for user story approval and has stated they will continue to monitor throughout the development process to validate that BHA's expectations are met.

Recommend BHA request SI define and employ a process for requirement elaboration tracking and approval in TFS. IVV will continue to monitor to validate that the BHA's expectations are met.

Recommend BHA request SI base design decision on what's best suited for BHA and not on what issues/problems/risks associated with the use of accelerators. Recommend BHA request the SI identify strategies and activities to mitigate typical complications (may break other things in the accelerator) and focus on primarily on TFS governance. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend BHA request the SI identify strategies and activities to mitigate typical complications (may break other things in the accelerator) and focus on primarily on TFS governance. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend BHA request SI engage TFS experts who can provide technical elaborations, but it seems they are doing it outside of TFS. The SI seems unclear about BHA's expectations for user story approval and has stated they will continue to monitor throughout the development process to validate that the BHA's expectations are met.

Recommend BHA request SI provide detailed information on what's being provided at a point in the project when it is urgently needed. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend the SI make efforts to conduct meetings in manner that engages the SME's continue to prefer to call-in to meetings instead of correct SME's seem to be in attendance. However, some SME's continue to refrain from attending in person. SI has observed that some SME's could not make meetings and provide little to no input. SI will continue to monitor for full participation including SME's in person attendance at project meetings.

Recommend BHA request SI engage TFS experts who can provide technical elaborations, but it seems they are doing it outside of TFS. The SI seems unclear about BHA's expectations for user story approval and has stated they will continue to monitor throughout the development process to validate that the BHA's expectations are met.

Recommend BHA request the SI identify strategies and activities to mitigate typical complications (may break other things in the accelerator) and focus on primarily on TFS governance. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend BHA request SI base design decision on what's best suited for BHA and not on what issues/problems/risks associated with the use of accelerators. Recommend BHA request the SI identify strategies and activities to mitigate typical complications (may break other things in the accelerator) and focus on primarily on TFS governance. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend BHA request SI provide detailed information on what's being provided at a point in the project when it is urgently needed. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend the SI make efforts to conduct meetings in manner that engages the SME's continue to prefer to call-in to meetings instead of correct SME's seem to be in attendance. However, some SME's continue to refrain from attending in person. SI has observed that some SME's could not make meetings and provide little to no input. SI will continue to monitor for full participation including SME's in person attendance at project meetings.

Recommend BHA request SI provide detailed information on what's being provided at a point in the project when it is urgently needed. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend the SI make efforts to conduct meetings in manner that engages the SME's continue to prefer to call-in to meetings instead of correct SME's seem to be in attendance. However, some SME's continue to refrain from attending in person. SI has observed that some SME's could not make meetings and provide little to no input. SI will continue to monitor for full participation including SME's in person attendance at project meetings.

Recommend BHA request SI provide detailed information on what's being provided at a point in the project when it is urgently needed. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend the SI make efforts to conduct meetings in manner that engages the SME's continue to prefer to call-in to meetings instead of correct SME's seem to be in attendance. However, some SME's continue to refrain from attending in person. SI has observed that some SME's could not make meetings and provide little to no input. SI will continue to monitor for full participation including SME's in person attendance at project meetings.

Recommend BHA request SI provide detailed information on what's being provided at a point in the project when it is urgently needed. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend the SI make efforts to conduct meetings in manner that engages the SME's continue to prefer to call-in to meetings instead of correct SME's seem to be in attendance. However, some SME's continue to refrain from attending in person. SI has observed that some SME's could not make meetings and provide little to no input. SI will continue to monitor for full participation including SME's in person attendance at project meetings.

Recommend BHA request SI provide detailed information on what's being provided at a point in the project when it is urgently needed. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend the SI make efforts to conduct meetings in manner that engages the SME's continue to prefer to call-in to meetings instead of correct SME's seem to be in attendance. However, some SME's continue to refrain from attending in person. SI has observed that some SME's could not make meetings and provide little to no input. SI will continue to monitor for full participation including SME's in person attendance at project meetings.

Recommend BHA request SI provide detailed information on what's being provided at a point in the project when it is urgently needed. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend the SI make efforts to conduct meetings in manner that engages the SME's continue to prefer to call-in to meetings instead of correct SME's seem to be in attendance. However, some SME's continue to refrain from attending in person. SI has observed that some SME's could not make meetings and provide little to no input. SI will continue to monitor for full participation including SME's in person attendance at project meetings.

Recommend BHA request SI provide detailed information on what's being provided at a point in the project when it is urgently needed. If BHA leadership has stated that they have seen these risks in other state accelerator-based projects.

Recommend the SI make efforts to conduct meetings in manner that engages the SME's continue to prefer to call-in to meetings instead of correct SME's seem to be in attendance. However, some SME's continue to refrain from attending in person. SI has observed that some SME's could not make meetings and provide little to no input. SI will continue to monitor for full participation including SME's in person attendance at project meetings.
1/23/18: The initial draft of the architecture blueprint document appears to be well thought through and design details were well thought out. In addition, on 2/5, the incoming project manager (PM) has been onboarded, and their implementation has been cleared, currently scheduled for 2/15.

1/23/18: Risk: The project discovery, analysis, and design details could negatively impact the schedule of the project. The project schedule risk is ranked as low. Stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project has been planned and is currently scheduled for 2/15.

1/23/18: SI resource turnover is low.

2/23/18: Medium: The BHA SME’s competing for project tasks with SMEs in other subcontracted agencies. Though the task has been rescheduled to a later date, there is some resistance to participate in project activities. SI will attend and participate, if project meeting has been rescheduled, rescheduling meetings is a necessity.

1/23/18: Risk: The project management plan provides few details of the project management processes. Stakeholders have been informed, and the project management processes have been identified. Though weekly status reports are carefully managed, more difficult to manage, are more labor intensive and costlier to manage than risks. IV&V has identified lack of participation in project risk management plan. Suggest SI and BHA agree on a process to ensure participation will ensue. Many times, project tasks are set aside instead of attending project. When project, attendance creates typically much more engagement that those who don’t. Many attendees who call off the record to not participate.

2/23/18: The current SI risk management plan provides few details of the project management processes, and design and could negatively impact the project schedule. Though the SI risk management plan provides few details of the project management processes, and design and could negatively impact the project schedule, stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 2/23/18.

2/23/18: Low: Federal funding risk is still an active risk to the project. The current SI risk management plan provides few details of the project management processes. Though Federal funding risk is still an active risk to the project, stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 2/23/18.

2/23/18: Low: PM identified that the SI’s training on SI management processes and other is lacking. Though the SI’s training on SI management processes and other is lacking, stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 2/23/18.

9/01/17: Unclear: BHA SME’s competing for project tasks. Stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 9/01/17.

9/01/17: Unclear: BHA SME’s competing for project tasks. Stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 9/01/17.

2/5/18: Approach to the documentation of SI management processes, and design and could negatively impact the project schedule. Though weekly status reports are carefully managed, more difficult to manage, are more labor intensive and costlier to manage than risks. Though weekly status reports are carefully managed, more difficult to manage, are more labor intensive and costlier to manage than risks. Stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 2/5/18.

2/5/18: RFP requires SI management processes and other is lacking. Though the RFP requires SI management processes and other is lacking, stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 2/5/18.

1/23/18: SI risk management processes should be documented in the SI’s project risk management plan. Stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 1/23/18.

1/23/18: SI’s project risk management plan should be documented in the SI’s project risk management plan. Stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 1/23/18.

2/23/18: SI’s project risk management plan should be documented in the SI’s project risk management plan. Stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 2/23/18.

1/23/18: SI’s project risk management plan should be documented in the SI’s project risk management plan. Stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 1/23/18.

2/23/18: SI’s project risk management plan should be documented in the SI’s project risk management plan. Stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 2/23/18.

1/23/18: SI’s project risk management plan should be documented in the SI’s project risk management plan. Stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 1/23/18.

2/23/18:SI’s project risk management plan should be documented in the SI’s project risk management plan. Stakeholders have been contacted, and project management has been involved. The project is currently scheduled for 2/23/18.