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## Executive Summary

### Overall Project Health:

- Green circle

Several risks were closed during this reporting period. IV&V opened one new observation that addresses project resourcing, and one new risk speaks to the timing of user story approval. Thus far, the project remains on schedule for completion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feb 18</th>
<th>Mar 18</th>
<th>Apr 18</th>
<th>Process Areas</th>
<th>IV&amp;V Findings and Observations</th>
<th>Overall Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Vendor Project Management</td>
<td>IV&amp;V observed progress in this area and several (5) findings were closed during the current reporting period. The closed risks addressed: #1 Unclear SDLC, #9 Attention to knowledge transfer, #11 SME participation challenges, #15 Attention to tracking out-of-scope requirements, and #22 Unclear risk management processes. Risks that remain in this area primarily focus on potential impacts to the project timeline (e.g., data migration, resource availability), and ensuring that system functionality will meet the DOH’s needs (e.g., sprint durations, incorporation of pain points and process improvements).</td>
<td>Green circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Requirements Management</td>
<td>Clarification around TFS governance is still required. Requirement elaborations (and some notes that are captured during demonstration sessions) are not always consistently documented in TFS, which can negatively impact the project scope and timeline. IV&amp;V believes that clarifying requirements through requirements elaboration is different from clarifying functionality. While both can be done based upon the user stories, BHA must take ownership of the requirements to ensure that the solution will meet their program needs and objectives.</td>
<td>Green circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Executive Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Areas</th>
<th>IV&amp;V Findings and Observations</th>
<th>Overall Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 18 Mar 18 Apr 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Design and Development</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>IV&amp;V still needs to get a better understanding of how the SI plans to mitigate the potential risks of using its accelerator; particularly in relation to risks cited in other areas that speak to the solution meeting the BHA's needs. While the project is mitigating the risk of potential development delays by asserting firmer deadlines for user story approval and moving unapproved early iteration user stories to future iterations, IV&amp;V will continue to monitor the open risks in this area.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Organizational Change Management</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>A comprehensive strategy to support user adoption does not appear to exist. While the SI has committed to mid-sprint SME validations of functionality to provide the opportunity for user involvement, this does not appear to be occurring on a consistent basis. During this assessment period the BHA assumed the lead responsibility for developing a more comprehensive OCM Plan, with assistance from RSM. Thus, the BHA distributed a &quot;User Engagement and Opportunities for Organizational Change Management&quot; staff survey to help focus their initial OCM efforts. The survey will be distributed on a periodic basis throughout the project to monitor progress. IV&amp;V will review the draft OCM Plan during the coming assessment period.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of this reporting period, PCG has identified a total of 25 findings (19 risks and 6 observations) on the Hawaii BHA Integrated Case Management System Project. Focusing on the total number of project risks, 7 of the 19 risks have been closed, leaving 12 open risks. Of those, there are zero high risks, 3 medium risks (or 25%) and 9 low risks (or 75%) as shown below.
IV&V Activities

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 weekly SI project status meetings
  2. Facilitated IV&V Monthly Report review meetings
  3. Facilitated IV&V Status meeting
  4. Attended Calculator review sessions
  5. Attended Data Migration Meeting
  6. Attended select Daily Scrum meetings
  7. Attended Project Steering Committee meeting
  8. Drafted SI Deliverable review process
  10. Reviewed the following deliverables: SI Iteration Plan, SI Iteration 1 Test Plan, SI Iteration Schedule, SI Updated Data Migration Strategy, SI Updated Roadmap

• 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 SI draft and final 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Findings (Classified as Observations, Risks or Issues)</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><strong>Potential project schedule impact due to data migration delays (R):</strong> The project has assigned CAMHD technical staff to assist DDD staff in support of these efforts. As an outcome, DDD decided against migrating Medisoft data to the new solution. DDD also assigned additional staff to the project to help with data clean-up and validation. Although the SI and BHA have made strides in addressing the data migration risks through weekly status/planning meetings and other activities with the hopes that development roadblocks can be avoided, IV&amp;V will continue to monitor this risk due to its significance to the project.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Unclear review and approval process for project deliverables (R):</strong> Some confusion remains over deliverable names and the approval process but efforts are underway to clarify and ensure all deliverables are meeting project needs. Meetings to provide further clarification are upcoming. IV&amp;V will continue to monitor to validate that this process is consistently followed.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>Competing priorities of BHA SMEs could negatively impact the project timeline (R):</strong> BHA is working with SI to mitigate resource challenges, as some key members of the project team have been over-tasked. CAMHD resources have been reallocated to assist DDD in support of data migration. The project has asserted firmer deadlines to address delays in user story approval.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><strong>SI Solution Architect extended leave could impact project productivity/quality (New Observation!):</strong> Since this position currently fills several significant project roles (e.g., Development Lead, Lead Business Analyst, and Scrum Master) the project schedule may be impacted. The SI has been tasked with developing a transition plan to provide adequate coverage during this staff outage.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Access to enhanced federal funding may impact the project budget and/or scope (I):</strong> Ability to access enhanced federal funding as initially planned is at risk due to external dependencies (e.g., State Medicaid Agency delays in completing its MITA State Self-Assessment (SS-A) and completion of P-APD). DHS plans on submitting the P-APD during the coming review period, with the BHA I-APD to follow. The BHA is pursuing other funding sources to bridge this gap.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Issues 18 and 19 are not specific to the SI but have a significant impact on project completion.*
### Monitoring for Closure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Findings</strong></th>
<th><strong>Recommendations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Long sprint / iteration cycles (R):</strong> As mentioned in last month’s report, the SI has committed to targeted, mid-sprint SME validations of functionality to address concerns over sprint durations and increase user involvement. However, it appears that this only occurred for the Calculator 2.0 sprint, and has not been carried forward into Iteration 1. IV&amp;V suggests getting this agreement in writing and will monitor the consistency and frequency of SI initiated mid-sprint demos in future iterations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Late-game analysis of requirements awaiting details from external sources (R):</strong> Sign-off is being sought on some user-stories that may require further analysis based upon external dependencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>SI Resource (PM) Turnover (O):</strong> IV&amp;V observed that some of the PM practices that were implemented upon project start-up may not have been carried over to the SI’s new PM. For example, although the SI is contractually required to develop Deliverable Expectation Documents (DEDs) prior to developing draft deliverables, this practice is no longer occurring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>SI identification/tracking of pain points (R):</strong> While CAMHD and DDD have identified pain points, the SI’s process to address these pain points remains unclear. This risk is also discussed in the OCM process area on page 13 of this report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Attention to process improvement seems insufficient (R):</strong> While some improvements have been seen in this area, IV&amp;V has concerns over the SI’s attention to the details of DOH’s expressed needs (e.g., drag and drop functionality in Calculator 2.0 functionality, calendar vs. calculator functionality).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IV&V Findings and Recommendations

### Vendor Project Management Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Suggest SI analyze data migration dependencies to avoid development delays. Once identified, IV&amp;V suggests that the SI validate and/or update the user stories and architectural plans that may impact the project schedule. Suggest BHA continue to coordinate resources to accelerate data migration activities, track detailed data migration tasks, and work with the SI to ensure development is not delayed.</td>
<td>In-process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Meet with the SI to clarify deliverable review and approval processes in accordance with RFP requirements. Deliverable review sessions should be considered to ensure clear understanding and open dialog around each deliverable. Deliverables should only be signed off when all issues have been resolved with BHA leadership and the signoff process should leave no room for ambiguity. Deliverable names should also be clarified. Finally, recommend BHA and SI come to agreement on deliverables best suited (and most beneficial) to be &quot;live&quot; documents (i.e. documents that will continue to be updated throughout the project as content becomes available/solidified).</td>
<td>In-process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Analyze/monitor BHA SME capacity to avoid potential project delays and communicate expectations clearly to staff. Recommend BHA leadership actively encourage and support staff participation and assist them with prioritizing their duties to accommodate full participation in the project.</td>
<td>In-process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Recommend BHA continue to work closely with DHS to pursue available funding options</td>
<td>In-process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV&V Findings and Recommendations

**Requirements Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Findings (Classified as Observations, Risks or Issues)</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>TFS governance process (R):</strong> TFS (Microsoft's Team Foundation Server) is the project's central repository database of all requirements, user stories, development tasks, test cases, bugs, and source code. While some progress has been made towards clarifying TFS governance (how the tool, and certain aspects of the tool will be used), concerns remain that confusion may still exist, which can lead to inadequate requirements management.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Tracking of requirement elaborations (R):</strong> IV&amp;V has found that the elaboration (i.e., clarification) of requirements and notes recorded during demos are not always consistently tracked in TFS. IV&amp;V recognizes that further elaboration can occur as tasks under the user stories are created. However, while functionality may be further clarified, the actual requirement may not necessarily be clarified through this process. Greater requirements clarification increases the likelihood of building the functionality to meet those requirements. If the focus is on user stories, the developer may only create the functionality in the user story rather than focusing on finding better ways to meet the requirement (which may be different from what’s in the user story). To mitigate this risk, the BHA must ensure that the requirements are clearly captured in the user stories and that the acceptance criteria is met.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best Practices**

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

**Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Request SI to document the TFS governance process and provide to BHA for review and approval</td>
<td>In-process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Request SI define and employ a process for requirement elaboration tracking and approval</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IV&V Findings and Recommendations

### Design and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Findings (Classified as Observations, Risks or Issues)</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Use of accelerator (R):</strong> While IV&amp;V recognizes efficiencies can be gained with an accelerator, failure to optimize the system to meet BHA specific needs is a potential risk that should be monitored in relation to IV&amp;V’s observations in other areas (see page 8).</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>Architecture Blueprint and Roadmap deficiencies (O):</strong> IV&amp;V cited deficiencies in the SI’s Architecture Blueprint and Roadmap deliverables based on industry best practice. Our review of these revised deliverables is pending delivery by the SI in the next reporting period.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>Delays in approving user stories could impact the project schedule (New Risk!):</strong> While the project has asserted firmer deadlines to address delays in BHA’s approval of user stories and the SI has been able to move unapproved early iteration user stories to future iterations to avoid delays in development, further delays could impact the project schedule. Approval of outstanding user stories is anticipated next month.</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>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Recommend BHA request SI to document the measures that will be taken to mitigate the risks of using an Accelerator.
- Recommend SI document sufficient design details in the architectural blueprint document and that content focus on what the SI will do as opposed to what the products/platform can do.
- Recommend BHA work with SI to ensure delays do not incur project delays or additional costs.
# IV&V Findings and Recommendations

## Organizational Change Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Findings (Classified as Observations, Risks or Issues)</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Minimal attention to User Adoption (R):</strong> The project seems to lack a comprehensive strategy to support user adoption and organizational change management (OCM). While the SI has committed to mid-sprint SME validations of functionality to provide the opportunity for user involvement, this has only occurred during the Calculator 2.0 sprint (see Finding #2). This risk has attracted the attention of the State CIO and the project has recognized the need for a formal OCM Plan that will be reviewed by ETS. The BHA has initiated a &quot;User Engagement and Opportunities for Organizational Change Management&quot; survey to help focus their OCM efforts and develop user adoption metrics.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Use of pain points to improve OCM (R):</strong> (See Vendor Project Management Finding #6) The SI’s process to address BHA’s pain points has not been clearly documented. The project’s ability to address those pain points will help to show users that the system is solving real business problems and lead to increased adoption rates. The BHA has assumed the lead role in developing a more thorough OCM Plan to support the project’s needs with support from RSM. An OCM survey was distributed to staff during this assessment period to inform the development of the Plan. IV&amp;V will review this Plan upon delivery of the draft and monitor OCM activities throughout the project.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Best Practices

- An OCM Plan that addresses the integration of individual and organizational change management to ensure the achievement of business results is developed.
- 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>Recommendation</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request the SI adopt a general user adoption strategy that is reflected in the OCM Plan.</td>
<td>In-process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree on an approach for how the SI will utilize/incorporate the pain point list in the OCM Plan.</td>
<td>In-process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence work on a comprehensive OCM Plan immediately.</td>
<td>In-process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

- See Findings and Recommendations Log (provided under separate cover)
- Project Health Rating Definitions

- The project is under control and the current scope can be delivered within the current schedule.
  - The project’s risks and issues have been identified, and mitigation activities are effective. The overall impact of risk and issues is minimal.
  - The project is proceeding according to plan (< 30 days late).

- The project is under control but also actively addressing resource, schedule or scope challenges that have arisen. There is a clear plan to get back on track.
  - The project’s risk and/or issues have been identified, and further mitigation is required to facilitate forward progress. The known impact of potential risks and known issues are likely to jeopardize the project.
  - Schedule issues are emerging ( > 30 days but < 60 days late).
  - Project Leadership attention is required to ensure the project is under control.

- The project is not under control as there are serious problems with resources, schedule, or scope. A plan to get back on track is needed.
  - The project’s risks and issues pose significant challenges and require immediate mitigation and/or escalation. The project’s ability to complete critical tasks and/or meet the project’s objectives is compromised and is preventing the project from progressing forward.
  - Significant schedule issues exist (> 60 days late). Milestone and task completion dates will need to be re-planned.
  - Executive management and/or project sponsorship attention is required to bring the project under control.
### Criticality Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></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><strong>M</strong></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><strong>L</strong></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 (3/26/18 – 4/20/18)
2. BHA IV&V Monthly Report review meeting
3. BHA/RSM IV&V Monthly Report review meeting
4. IV&V Status meeting (4/11/18)
5. Data Migration Meeting (3/28/18)
6. RSM Calculator 2.0 Post UAT Review
7. RSM Calculator 2.0 Follow up
8. BHA-ITS Review Iteration #1 Test Plan
9. Daily Scrum meetings (selected)
10. Project Steering Committee meeting

Artifacts reviewed during the reporting period:

1. SI Iteration Plan
2. SI Iteration 1 Test Plan
3. SI Iteration Schedule
4. SI Updated Data Migration Strategy
5. SI Updated Roadmap
6. SI Updated User Story Life Cycle
7. SI Defect (Bug) Life Cycle
8. SI Weekly Status Reports
9. Daily Scrum Notes (selected)
10. SI Project Schedule

Eclipse IV&V® Base Standards and Checklists
improvement seems to be a mixture of Agile and waterfall. 1)  Meet with the SI to request elicitation and maintenance of prioritized business process pain points.

When implementing Agile development, focus on long iteration cycles. Long sprint/iteration cycles can be a reduction of ongoing project funding, a weakened SI reputation, and public scrutiny. Finding a balance of Agile and waterfall processes is key.

Failure to track pain points and business problems can lead to a final product that fails to meet expectations. Swapping can incur significant future costs as it’s likely BHA will need to implement (and acquire separate funding for) features that get swapped out of the original fixed price project scope.

One of the primary benefits of an Agile approach is that requirements that are not yet fully defined can be incrementally delivered. This allows teams to address/incorporate these pain points to show users that the system is solving real business problems which should lead to increased adoption rates. While the SI’s reluctance to utilize visual tools (e.g. whiteboard walk throughs alone) may limit their ability to implement (and acquire separate funding for) features that get swapped out of the original fixed price project scope, visual tools can help to facilitate to be system design discussions.

The SI has recommended an xRM site for BHA to review as an example of one such site. Reporting the results of the observation will inform the next steps.

Agile development projects drive users to define requirements system. The benefits include shorter time-to-market and early visibility of project status. However, in order to get the maximum benefits from an Agile approach, it is essential to define requirements at an appropriate depth.

The SI has committed to providing mid-sprint demos for select SMEs to validate complex or unclear user story implementations. 

3/20/18: SI has stated that tracking pain points is out of scope and that pain points need to be raised by SMEs to be considered for future iterations.

3/14/18: SI demo’d progress on a separate development effort called the “Calculator” — a cost-effective way for business units to address/incorporate these pain points to show users that the system is solving real business problems which should lead to increased adoption rates.

Recommendation: SI should clearly communicate plans and details of upcoming activities before they occur. Recommendation: BHA request the SI continue to provide further SDLC and iteration activities detail and request the IL engage with the SI throughout the iteration to ensure the system design and functionality meets users needs and expectations. 

Recommendation: SI seems more willing to close issues that are not relevant for the project than those that are. SI seems to be more concerned with advancing their process improvements than the actual project outcomes. SI should maintain a high-level list of requirements, prioritize, and define requirements at an appropriate level of detail to facilitate user adoption and buy-in by providing visibility to the users of problems that need improvement. 

Recommendation: SI seems to be more concerned with advancing their process improvements than the actual project outcomes. SI should maintain a high-level list of requirements, prioritize, and define requirements at an appropriate level of detail to facilitate user adoption and buy-in by providing visibility to the users of problems that need improvement.

3/1/18: BHA has indicated that individual efforts by SI analysts during user story meetings have not made up for the lack of analysis depth during the discovery phase.

3/7/18: BHA has contracted a SI in a separate effort to develop a calendar tool. While BHA has indicated that solicitation Phases 1 and 2 to be kept at arm’s length, the SI is not defining specifications for a manual import tool.

Recommendation: SI clearly communicate plans and details of upcoming activities before they occur. Recommendation: BHA request the SI continue to provide further SDLC and iteration activities detail and request the IL engage with the SI throughout the iteration to ensure the system design and functionality meets users needs and expectations. 

Recommendation: SI seems more willing to close issues that are not relevant for the project than those that are. SI seems to be more concerned with advancing their process improvements than the actual project outcomes. SI should maintain a high-level list of requirements, prioritize, and define requirements at an appropriate level of detail to facilitate user adoption and buy-in by providing visibility to the users of problems that need improvement.

3/10/18: SI has recommended an xRM site for BHA to review as an example of one such site. Reporting the results of the observation will inform the next steps.

3/2/18: SI has stated that tracking pain points is out of scope and that pain points need to be raised by SMEs to be considered for future iterations.

3/14/18: SI demo’d progress on a separate development effort called the “Calculator” — a cost-effective way for business units to address/incorporate these pain points to show users that the system is solving real business problems which should lead to increased adoption rates.

Recommendation: SI should clearly communicate plans and details of upcoming activities before they occur. Recommendation: BHA request the SI continue to provide further SDLC and iteration activities detail and request the IL engage with the SI throughout the iteration to ensure the system design and functionality meets users needs and expectations. 

Recommendation: SI seems more willing to close issues that are not relevant for the project than those that are. SI seems to be more concerned with advancing their process improvements than the actual project outcomes. SI should maintain a high-level list of requirements, prioritize, and define requirements at an appropriate level of detail to facilitate user adoption and buy-in by providing visibility to the users of problems that need improvement.

3/7/18: BHA has contracted a SI in a separate effort to develop a calendar tool. While BHA has indicated that solicitation Phases 1 and 2 to be kept at arm’s length, the SI is not defining specifications for a manual import tool.

Recommendation: SI clearly communicate plans and details of upcoming activities before they occur. Recommendation: BHA request the SI continue to provide further SDLC and iteration activities detail and request the IL engage with the SI throughout the iteration to ensure the system design and functionality meets users needs and expectations. 

Recommendation: SI seems more willing to close issues that are not relevant for the project than those that are. SI seems to be more concerned with advancing their process improvements than the actual project outcomes. SI should maintain a high-level list of requirements, prioritize, and define requirements at an appropriate level of detail to facilitate user adoption and buy-in by providing visibility to the users of problems that need improvement.

3/10/18: SI has recommended an xRM site for BHA to review as an example of one such site. Reporting the results of the observation will inform the next steps.

3/2/18: SI has stated that tracking pain points is out of scope and that pain points need to be raised by SMEs to be considered for future iterations.

3/14/18: SI demo’d progress on a separate development effort called the “Calculator” — a cost-effective way for business units to address/incorporate these pain points to show users that the system is solving real business problems which should lead to increased adoption rates.

Recommendation: SI should clearly communicate plans and details of upcoming activities before they occur. Recommendation: BHA request the SI continue to provide further SDLC and iteration activities detail and request the IL engage with the SI throughout the iteration to ensure the system design and functionality meets users needs and expectations. 

Recommendation: SI seems more willing to close issues that are not relevant for the project than those that are. SI seems to be more concerned with advancing their process improvements than the actual project outcomes. SI should maintain a high-level list of requirements, prioritize, and define requirements at an appropriate level of detail to facilitate user adoption and buy-in by providing visibility to the users of problems that need improvement.

3/7/18: BHA has contracted a SI in a separate effort to develop a calendar tool. While BHA has indicated that solicitation Phases 1 and 2 to be kept at arm’s length, the SI is not defining specifications for a manual import tool.

Recommendation: SI clearly communicate plans and details of upcoming activities before they occur. Recommendation: BHA request the SI continue to provide further SDLC and iteration activities detail and request the IL engage with the SI throughout the iteration to ensure the system design and functionality meets users needs and expectations. 

Recommendation: SI seems more willing to close issues that are not relevant for the project than those that are. SI seems to be more concerned with advancing their process improvements than the actual project outcomes. SI should maintain a high-level list of requirements, prioritize, and define requirements at an appropriate level of detail to facilitate user adoption and buy-in by providing visibility to the users of problems that need improvement.
IV&V has reported that new SI PM/Lead Analyst has not shown sufficient knowledge and interest in discovery sessions. Some meetings have ended before attendance as discovery sessions do not seem to be in attendance. Key SMEs have been absent from meeting attendance.

Recommend SI make efforts to conduct meetings in a manner that engages the attendees, while keeping the meeting on track, if participation is not encouraged, new buy-in and adoption of the system is at risk. Lack of good preparation for SI meetings with clients can create a reluctance among SMEs, encourages participation by silent attendees, and utilizes visual techniques to help the attendees, while keeping the meeting on track. If participation is not encouraged, new buy-in and adoption of the system is at risk. Failure to implement an effective user adoption strategy could lead to resistance during system rollout, insufficient user adoption and the value of attending meetings in general.

Recommend SI review and prepare questions based on process flows before meetings. SI seems to be improving as evidenced by the recent Calculator sprint demo. SI seems to be improving as evidenced by the recent Calculator sprint demo. SI seems to be improving as evidenced by the recent Calculator sprint demo.

SI added 3 PM resources to the project and shifted the lead analyst. Seems this demo was initiated by BHA.

Recommend SI review and prepare questions based on process flows before meetings. SI seems to be improving as evidenced by the recent Calculator sprint demo.
The scope of the accelerator is to leverage an accelerator as a starting point for system development. Among the key benefits of using an accelerator are:

- Reduced development time and cost
- Improved quality and reliability
- Enhanced functionality and performance
- Quick delivery to market
- Lower risk of project failure
- Increased productivity and efficiency

However, the benefits realized from using an accelerator can vary depending on the specific needs and requirements of the project. In some cases, the accelerator may provide a solid foundation for system development, while in others, it may require extensive modification and customization to meet the project's requirements.

The BHA is responsible for ensuring that the requirements are clearly captured in the user stories and that the acceptance criteria exist for all requirements. The team will continue to monitor for well-formed acceptance criteria to ensure that the requirements are clearly captured in the user stories and that the acceptance criteria exist.

**Risks and Risk Mitigation**

- **Risk:** Unstructured user stories may lead to poorly defined requirements.
  - **Mitigation:** Ensure that all user stories are well-formed and clearly define the requirements.
  - **Monitoring:** Continuously review user stories to ensure they meet the acceptance criteria.

- **Risk:** Lack of coordination between the development team and the business stakeholders.
  - **Mitigation:** Establish clear communication channels and regular meetings to ensure alignment.
  - **Monitoring:** Track progress and maintain regular check-ins.

- **Risk:** Insufficient testing and quality assurance.
  - **Mitigation:** Implement robust testing strategies and quality assurance processes.
  - **Monitoring:** Regularly review test results and ensure quality standards are met.

- **Risk:** Delays in project delivery.
  - **Mitigation:** Establish realistic timelines and monitor progress closely.
  - **Monitoring:** Continuously assess project status and adjust plans as needed.

**Recommendations**

- **Recommendation 1:** Develop a comprehensive testing strategy that covers all aspects of the accelerator.
  - **Action:** Review existing testing strategies and enhance them as necessary.

- **Recommendation 2:** Enhance the project's documentation to include detailed requirements and acceptance criteria.
  - **Action:** Update the documentation to reflect the latest changes and ensure it is accessible to all team members.

- **Recommendation 3:** Implement a feedback loop to capture user feedback and make necessary adjustments.
  - **Action:** Establish a mechanism for collecting user feedback and incorporating it into the development process.

**Conclusion**

The Accelerator project is on track to deliver a high-quality product that meets the BHA's requirements. However, continuous monitoring and adjustment are necessary to ensure the project's success.

**Next Steps**

- **Next Steps:** Finalize the testing strategy and start implementing it.
  - **Expected Outcomes:** Improved quality and reliability of the final product.
On 1/22/18, the SI announced that its PM/Lead Review and approval of deliverables may negatively impact the overall quality of work and product. The SMEs competing priorities can negatively impact the overall quality of work and product. The risk of an ineffective knowledge transfer from the departing PM/Lead Business Analyst to the SI's new PM can still be realized despite the SI's best efforts. While the remaining team that participated in discovery remains largely intact, it is unclear how long it will take for the incoming PM to get up to speed and ensure the quality of work and product delivery is consistent with previous standards.

Expectation Document, and Test Strategy. The SI Manager (who spent 100's of hours leading the project schedule.
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On 1/22/18, the SI announced that its PM/Lead Review and approval of deliverables may negatively impact the overall quality of work and product. The SMEs competing priorities can negatively impact the overall quality of work and product. The risk of an ineffective knowledge transfer from the departing PM/Lead Business Analyst to the SI's new PM can still be realized despite the SI's best efforts. While the remaining team that participated in discovery remains largely intact, it is unclear how long it will take for the incoming PM to get up to speed and ensure the quality of work and product delivery is consistent with previous standards.

Expectation Document, and Test Strategy. The SI Manager (who spent 100's of hours leading the project schedule. 4/11/18:  BHA has stated there does appear to some confusion around terminology (e.g., document status). BHA believes there remains some lack of alignment around the DCF process as part of the overall deliverable review and acceptance process. To address this, BHA updated the deliverables list and moved specific deliverables to “approved” in order to better align the expectations. BHA has agreed to plans, methodologies, activities and processes, when they have serious concerns about the deliverables that may impact the project, and adds them to our risk log as appropriate.

4/13/18:  IV&V has created a deliverable tracking log. IV&V recommends BHA review any critical deliverables that BHA and/or DOH consider to be approved, and other than on warning them, identify if there are any critical deliverables associated with the deliverables that may impact the project, and adds them to our risk log as appropriate.

4/13/18:  IV&V has created a deliverable tracking log. IV&V recommends BHA review any critical deliverables that BHA and/or DOH consider to be approved, and other than on warning them, identify if there are any critical deliverables associated with the deliverables that may impact the project, and adds them to our risk log as appropriate.

4/13/18:  IV&V has created a deliverable tracking log. IV&V recommends BHA review any critical deliverables that BHA and/or DOH consider to be approved, and other than on warning them, identify if there are any critical deliverables associated with the deliverables that may impact the project, and adds them to our risk log as appropriate.

4/13/18:  IV&V has created a deliverable tracking log. IV&V recommends BHA review any critical deliverables that BHA and/or DOH consider to be approved, and other than on warning them, identify if there are any critical deliverables associated with the deliverables that may impact the project, and adds them to our risk log as appropriate.
Delays in data migration are not uncommon - Development delays due to data migration delays are not uncommon - Data migration activity level of effort is often underestimated - IV&V has already identified a risk (#18) that BHA resources could be constrained due to data migration delays. - During the status meeting there is little to no updates to this slide for some time now. During the status meeting there is little to no discussion around risks. Also, the risk slide and the risk matrix are not updated. Additionally, the SI has chosen to provide little to no response to the risk slide that has been identified, the majority of which are within the SI's control to mitigate.  

**SI governance appears to be insufficient**  

The lack of attention to risk management could reduce overall project quality and health - Lack of a planned and documented design decisions could lead to confusion and rework by the development team and can hinder strategic planning (e.g. licensing) for the project. - The SI has not provided enough details in the status reports. Consideration should be given to increasing BHA resources to accelerate this risk.  

**Architecture and design deficiencies**  

2/23/18: RFP requires TFS governance to be documented in the Configuration Management Plan which is currently being developed by the SI.  

**Risk management processes**  

The current SI risk management plan provides few details of the risk management process. Though weekly status reports contain a slide for risks, there has been little to no updates to this slide for some time now. During the status meeting there is little to no discussion around risks. Also, the risk slide and the risk matrix are not updated. Additionally, the SI has chosen to provide little to no response to the risk slide that has been identified, the majority of which are within the SI's control to mitigate.  

**Issue in data migration activities could impact the development schedule**  

The process of tracking and managing data migration activities is an important part of the project. The SI has not provided enough details in the status reports. Consideration should be given to increasing BHA resources to accelerate this risk.  

**SI governance appears to be insufficient**  

The SI's governance process and plan needs to be reviewed and improved. Once better governance has been established, the SI will be able to monitor and address the risks identified.  

**Recommend BHA request SI to document the TFS governance process and provide a plan for review and approval.**

**Recommend SI to document the SI's governance process and provide a plan for review and approval.**

**Recommend BHA continue to work closely with DHS to pursue available funding options.**

**Concluding remarks**  

As the delivery of the project draws to a close, it is important to review the lessons learned and best practices that have been identified throughout the project. The SI should continue to provide detailed updates and provide a plan for review and approval. In the meantime, DOH is also pursuing 50/50 admin funding in addition to the CMS-64 allocation plan to allow DOH's project costs to be submitted on the CMS-64 form.  

**Project Management**

- SI Project

- SI Project

- SI Project

- SI Project

- SI Project

- SI Project

- SI Project

- SI Project
Delays in approving user stories could impact the project schedule. Delays in finalizing the user stories could impact the project schedule. While SME capacity constraints is partially to blame, SME indecisiveness appears to be the primary reason for the delays. BHA has stated that delayed user stories are the primary reason for the delays. BHA has stated that project leadership will soon finalize user stories for the SMEs and give them a due date for any objections/changes. So far, there have been a few unresolved objections to user stories to future iterations to avoid delays in development.

SI has stated that user story approval delays have impacted the project schedule and could delay iteration 1 sprint demo scheduled for 4/24/18. This delay could potentially push out the entire project schedule. Recommend BHA work with SI to ensure delays do not incur additional project costs. Recommend BHA continue current mitigation strategy of project leadership finalizing user stories for SMEs and make efforts to ensure SME participation in sprint demos (and mid-sprint demos) so there is clear understanding system functionality as it relates to the delayed user stories. Recommend BHA work with the SI to finalize user stories that require further analysis for later iterations. Recommend BHA request the SI assist SMEs with user stories that require further analysis or demonstration of CRM functionality/qualifications in order for SMEs to confidently approve them.

4/18/18: mpp dated 4/18/18 shows no slippage in iteration 1 sprint demo (show & tell).

SI Solution Architect extended leave could impact project productivity/quality.

SI has announced that the project Solution Architect will soon be going on extended leave (expected 3-4 weeks) to take extended leave. The SI has committed to transitioning responsibilities to existing project SI resources to ensure continuity. Projects that rely on a single person as the focal point of key project decisions, operational activities, system design, code/configuration quality, and understanding of user stories and requirements faces risks when that person is no longer available for any period of time. Impacts can include reduced overall team productivity, poor feature and architectural design decisions, poor code/configuration quality, and project delays. Attempts to transition responsibilities on other team members can realize the difficulty of transferring tacit knowledge to other team members.

4/15/18: SI announced the Solution Architect will soon be on extended leave (estimated at 4 weeks), his responsibilities will be distributed to the existing project team while he is out. Recommend BHA request further details of coverage while he is out and how this will be managed.

4/12/18: Seems the project Solution Architect currently holds multiple additional project roles including: Scrum Master, Development Lead, Business Analyst. Some additional roles may be temporary, while roles are transitioned to new resources, but may still pose a risk to the effectiveness of these roles when managed by a single individual.