March 14, 2019

The Honorable Ronald D. Kouchi,  
President, and  
Members of The Senate  
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Hawaii BHA Integrated Case Management System Project

Final IV&V Findings for the period of February 1 - 28, 2019
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RSM and BHA worked diligently to successfully implement the INSPIRE/MAX Solution on February 4th as planned. The partnership between RSM and BHA proved to play a significant role in the successful go-live, and will serve as a good foundation moving forward in the project. IV&V’s focus as of the February reporting period now turns to the Warranty and Stabilization period set to run through March 1st, and the design and development efforts of Phase 2.1.

IV&V observed great progress during the February reporting period, and has closed three findings and downgraded the severity of another three findings as a result. However, a number of risks to the overall scope of the project remain from Phase 1, most notably the status of project funding as DHS decided to withdraw the current IAPD in favor of submitting a new version; the need for increased clarity and possible enhancements to the State’s Enterprise Agreement with Microsoft specific to performance SLAs; and the project’s lack of a finalized and approved Help Desk Plan. IV&V opened a new risk based on an active problem with CRM Date/Time settings, and two new preliminary concerns related to the new User Story estimation process and BHA’s responsibilities for Phase 2 report writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec 18</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Process Areas</th>
<th>IV&amp;V Observations</th>
<th>Overall Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>The February 2019 reporting period risk rating and the Overall Health rating for the Project Management process area remain high (red) due to the withdrawal the current IAPD and the potential impact that prolonged approval may have on the project. There are unenforceable contractual SLAs in the State’s Enterprise Agreement with Microsoft, the project’s Help Desk Plan has not been finalized, and the lack of a formal process for managing project-level change. IV&amp;V is also tracking a new preliminary concern specific to the vendor’s User Story Point estimation process.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requirements Management</td>
<td>The February 2019 reporting period risk rating has been downgraded to a medium (yellow) and the Overall Health rating for the Requirements Management process area has been downgraded to a medium (yellow) due to BHA and RSM agreeing to an approach to ensure that ADA, Load, and Performance testing requirements are sufficiently satisfied in P2 and beyond. Additionally, RSM delivered the documentation to show the coverage of all P1 requirements to BHA on February 8, but this documentation has not yet been evaluated by BHA.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec 18</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Process Areas</th>
<th>IV&amp;V Observations</th>
<th>Overall Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Design and Development</td>
<td>The February 2019 reporting period risk rating for the Design and Development process area has been escalated to a medium (yellow), but the overall health of the Design and Development process area remains low (green). IV&amp;V opened a new risk related to the CRM Date/Time problem that is currently being worked by RSM and BHA, as well as a preliminary concern regarding BHA staff’s responsibility for Phase 2 report writing and the requisite knowledge needed to produce the reports.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>The February 2019 reporting period risk rating and the Overall Health rating for the Testing Management process area have both been downgraded to low (green). IV&amp;V maintains that there is still a low risk regarding the final configuration around DDD and CAMHD user roles, with the possibility of needing to create a new Clerical role.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td>The February 2019 reporting period risk rating and the Overall Health rating for the Data Management process area have both been downgraded to low (green) as the project successfully resolved the last outstanding problem related to Data Migration prior to go-live.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Organizational Change</td>
<td>The February 2019 reporting period risk rating and the Overall Health rating for the Organizational Change Management process area have been downgraded to low (green) as IV&amp;V has closed out the last remaining risk related to the finalization of the “Stabilization M and O Process” document, as RSM improved the details of the document and the processes defined in the document are being successfully executed.</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

As of the February 2019 reporting period, IV&V has 13 open findings: 8 risks (1 high, 3 medium, 4 low), 3 issues (2 high, 1 low), and 2 preliminary concerns.

IV&V closed 3 findings (all medium risks) during the February reporting period.

To date, IV&V has identified a total of 56 findings (10 issues, 37 risks, 7 observations, and 2 preliminary concerns) on the project; 43 of which have been closed.

See Appendix C for trend data related to IV&V’s monthly ratings for findings and overall project health.
IV&V Findings and Recommendations

Process Areas Reviewed

Throughout this project, IV&V will verify and validate activities performed in the following process areas:

• Project Management
• Requirements Management
• Design and Development
• Test Management
• Data Management
• Organizational Change Management
## IV&V Findings and Recommendations

### Project Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Access to enhanced federal funding may impact the project budget and/or scope:</strong> [Lead Entity: State] On 12/31/18, DHS and DOH submitted the revised IAPD to CMS. On 2/21 representatives from DOH and DHS met with CMS representatives to discuss the IAPD that was submitted on 12/31/18. CMS’ concerns are primarily related to cost allocation, tying the functional/technical requirements to advancing the Medicaid Enterprise’s MITA maturity, and obtaining approval for the MECT certification IV&amp;V activities. MQD has withdrawn the IAPD and developed a joint workplan with DOH to address all CMS concerns and requirements, with a planned resubmission date of March 15. This remains a high risk for the February Reporting period.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td><strong>Service Level Agreements (SLAs) are insufficiently documented:</strong> [Lead Entity: State] The RSM contract does not contain a complete and detailed reference to the state of HI’s Enterprise Agreement with Microsoft regarding service and performance levels, specifically incident and problem management, and solution millisecond response times. BHA continues to work with ETS to get additional information regarding the State’s Enterprise Agreement with Microsoft specific to performance standards. Based on information received from Microsoft, changes to the State’s EA with Microsoft may be required to ensure that the State gets the needed performance SLAs. However, the State’s EA is not set to be renegotiated for approximately 16 months, which means that significant change to the EA is not likely in the near future. In response to this, BHA is regularly working with Microsoft to improve interactions and response time, and recently has implemented a new streamlined approach to contacting Microsoft to get performance issues addressed. BHA and ETS plan to continue to work with Microsoft to improve Microsoft’s commitment to performance levels and response time. This remains a high risk for the February Reporting period.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV&V Findings and Recommendations

**Project Management (cont’d)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Findings (cont’d)</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td><strong>Help Desk Plan not yet developed</strong> [Lead Entity: State]. The project lacks a finalized Help Desk Plan that has been fully vetted, approved, and accepted as final. Despite not having a formalized plan, the Help Desk is fully operational. As there are three different entities in charge of operating the Help Desk (DDD, CAMHD, and RSM) and the technical expertise and experience with MS Dynamics varies amongst each team, having a comprehensive Help Desk Plan that is agreed to and approved by all parties is of significant importance. Additionally, without having documented Help Desk policies and processes, there is no substantive way to govern the process of improving Help Desk performance. IV&amp;V is escalating to a high issue until the document is completed and approved by the project.</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td><strong>Timeliness of Phase 2 Planning</strong> [Lead Entity: State]. IV&amp;V is closing this risk as the details of the Phase 2 Contract Amendment have been documented, vetted, and agreed to by both BHA and RSM, and is expected to be executed in early March.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Key Findings (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Findings (cont’d)</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td><strong>Proposed modifications to contractual responsibilities are not formally documented</strong> [<em>Lead Entity: State</em>]. IV&amp;V is aware that there may have been changes or &quot;swaps&quot; in contractual responsibilities (excluding User Stories) between state and vendor that were not recorded by either party. The details of the Phase 2 Contract Amendment have been documented, vetted, and agreed to by both BHA and RSM, which will result in a formalized update to the current RSM contract. This is a good step forward regarding controlling and managing agreements and changes to the contract. However, IV&amp;V is not aware of any steps taken to define and implement a formalized and repeatable process for controlling and managing contractual changes and agreements. IV&amp;V continues to recommend that BHA develop and implement a process for controlling and managing project-level changes. This remains a medium risk for the February Reporting period.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td><strong>New Preliminary Concern - New US Point Estimation Tool not yet reviewed or verified for accuracy by the State</strong> [<em>Lead Entity: Vendor</em>]. RSM is using a new process for estimating US points for bugs/requests in W/S and M&amp;O. Limited details on RSM’s process for estimating US Points, and for evaluating estimates vs actuals, have been provided. While RSM does provide burndown metrics for Phase 2 development on a weekly basis it only compares planned US Points vs actual US Points delivered, and does not provide details on the accuracy of estimates. IV&amp;V will work to better understand how the project estimates its resources, plans for allocation, and the processes used for equating effort, tools, and skill to US Points, as this process will impact planning for Phase 2 development efforts coupled with ongoing M&amp;O responsibilities.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IV&V Findings and Recommendations

### Project Management (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHA to continue to work closely with DHS to determine the appropriate path forward and continue to collaborate to satisfy any remaining and future requests from CMS.</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to work with State ETS and Microsoft to get agreement on the required service levels for the INSPIRE/Max solution, and have these SLAs formally updated and documented in the states EA with Microsoft.</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize the comprehensive Help Desk Plan, ensure it is appropriately socialized and understood by all parties, and monitor Help Desk activities to verify that the designed processes and tools are utilized as intended.</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHA should strongly consider acquiring an IT Service Management (ITSM) tool to support and empower current Help Desk operations, as well as support future M&amp;O efforts.</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHA should create a formal change management plan, process, and document to ensure that all changes or to contractual responsibilities are appropriately documented</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSM’s new estimation tool/process should be demonstrated for BHA for information and validation purposes. Additionally, actual duration/LoE should be tracked along with the estimated LoE to enable future process improvement efforts.</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# IV&V Findings and Recommendations

## Requirements Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td><strong>Requirements to user stories' associations are inconsistent within TFS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>[Lead Entity: Vendor]</em>: As a component of IV&amp;V’s RTM validation effort for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>requirements to user stories, approximately 9% of the sample size (and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thus, potentially the entire project) are missing required TFS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationships between requirements and all user stories. RSM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>submitted the requirements documentation to the State on February 8th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(an adjusted date agreed to by both RSM and BHA). As of 2/27, BHA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>had not yet performed a detailed review of the documentation, and, as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a result, IV&amp;V's involvement in this effort remains on hold. This</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>remains a low risk in the February Reporting period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>**A subset of contractual Requirements may not be fully included in user</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stories or the developed/constructed BHA-ITS software**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>[Lead Entity: Vendor]</em>: As a component of IV&amp;V’s RTM validation effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for requirements to user stories, IV&amp;V identified requirements that are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not included in user stories and/or the BHA-ITS software. RSM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>submitted the requirements documentation to the State on February 8th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(an adjusted date agreed to by both RSM and BHA). As of February 27,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BHA had not yet performed a detailed review of the documentation, and,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as a result, IV&amp;V's involvement in this effort remains on hold. This</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>remains a medium risk in the February Reporting period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>**The lack of ADA testing prevents the State from validating that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contractual ADA requirements will be met**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>[Lead Entity: Vendor]</em>: In February, RSM and BHA agreed to an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acceptable ADA testing approach to be executed in the scope of P2,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which has been memorialized in the “Deliverable Definitions” document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that will be an input to the upcoming Contract Amendment. IV&amp;V will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continue to monitor this risk through the completion of testing, but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is downgrading the risk priority to low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV&V Findings and Recommendations

Requirements Management (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>The lack of performance testing prevents the State from validating that contractual performance requirements will be met [Lead Entity: Vendor]. In February, RSM and BHA agreed to an acceptable performance testing approach to be executed in the scope of P2, which has been memorialized in the “Deliverable Definitions” document that will be an input to the upcoming Contract Amendment. IV&amp;V will continue to monitor this risk through the completion of testing, but is downgrading the risk priority to low.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>The lack of load and capacity testing prevents the State from validating that contractual load requirements will be met [Lead Entity: Vendor]. In February, RSM and BHA agreed to an acceptable load testing approach to be executed in the scope of P2, which has been memorialized in the “Deliverable Definitions” document that will be an input to the upcoming Contract Amendment. IV&amp;V will continue to monitor this risk through the completion of testing, but is downgrading the risk priority to low.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IV&V Findings and Recommendations

### Requirements Management (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Identify inconsistencies in requirements to user story relationships within TFS in order to ensure that complete requirements traceability is established for the project.</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify inconsistencies in requirements implementation in user stories and the BHA-ITS software and incorporate all requirements determined to be missing in both user stories and the BHA-ITS software solution.</td>
<td>Not started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DOH work with RSM to ensure all contractually required testing is adequately planned and executed as specified in the contract</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure the components of ADA Section 508 requirements that the MS documentation states Dynamics “Meets with Exception” are thoroughly tested to ensure there are no gaps in compliance.</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV&V Findings and Recommendations

#### Design and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td><strong>New Risk - CRM Date and Time issues related to Users Time Zone</strong> [Lead Entity: Shared]. It was discovered that when a user’s CRM time zone is not set to HST, it impacts the date and time stamp of recorded actions and transactions. Root cause analysis has been completed and RSM and BHA are jointly working to implement a solution to fix impacted CRM data. RSM is planning to release a fix to production on March 1 to resolve the problem with 12 billing-related entities, but further analysis is needed to determine how to implement the solution for approximately 15 additional entities that could be impacted downstream.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td><strong>New Preliminary Concern - BHA Report Writing Responsibilities</strong> [Lead Entity: State]. A portion of the Phase 2 report writing (based on report complexity and assigned US Points) is the responsibility of BHA, with 2.25 FTE being required. BHA is currently concerned that they do not have staff with sufficient knowledge of SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS) to fulfill this task. BHA must determine what reports are needed by when, and develop a prioritized order for report development. Then, BHA must determine if there are any knowledge gaps in developing the reports that needs to be addressed, and develop a plan to implement training before writing activities begin.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSM and BHA should continue to collaborate on the root cause analysis of the problem and jointly determine a long term, permanent solution for all potentially impacted entities. Additionally, once root cause is determined, steps should be taken to identify what can be done by the project to proactively mitigate configuration risks similar to this from occurring in the future.</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHA should immediately identify any gaps in knowledge, skill, and experience in SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS) and reporting writing, and seek immediate remediation, such as training staff up.</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV&V Findings and Recommendations

#### Test Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td><strong>User Roles and Team Setup configuration and testing process</strong> <em>[Lead Entity: Shared]</em>. DDD User Roles and Team Setup were not fully configured, tested, and finalized until the afternoon of January 31st, two business days before go-live. BHA and RSM continue to work on establishing and finalizing the last remaining user roles for both CAMHD and DDD, and are currently weighing the option of creating a new role for Clerical Staff. BHA and RSM remain in regular contact on configuring the user roles and updates are provided during the Twice Weekly Issue Meeting. This remains a low risk in the February Reporting period.</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• DDD, CAMHD, and RSM need to prioritize improving the roles and access setup, configuration, and testing process for future releases, ensuring that all access requirements and restrictions are clearly defined and documented.</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IV&V Findings and Recommendations

### Data Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Errors in the data migration files may impact the overall implementation schedule [Lead Entity: Shared]: The final remaining Data Migration issue was resolved prior to the 2/4 go-live. Data Migration work continues on the &quot;Optional&quot; DDD data (Service Auths and Contact Notes), however, is not considered to be essential to the success of Phase 2. IV&amp;V will continue to monitor the ongoing Data Migration efforts, however, is closing this risk in the February Reporting Period.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Both teams must work together to ensure that all documentation to support data migration processes is accurate, complete, and executed correctly.</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV&V Findings and Recommendations

Organizational Change Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Criticality Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>M&amp;O Plan not yet developed [Lead Entity: Vendor]. RSM incorporated some of the comments and feedback provided by both BHA and IV&amp;V prior to the final version of the “Stabilization M and O Process” document was approved by BHA. Additionally, agreement on W/S period FTE, hours, and prioritization were documented and agreed to the upcoming Contract Amendment. IV&amp;V will continue to monitor the progress and results of the Phase 1 W/S period, which includes daily and weekly updates from RSM, and will continue to identify areas for improvement in M&amp;O and future W/S periods. IV&amp;V is closing this risk as of the February Reporting Period.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Update and refine the draft “Stabilization M and O Processes” document (M&O Plan) to clearly adhere to all conditions and requirements detailed in the Warranty and Stabilization sections of the contract.
Appendix A: Rating Scales

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 (provided under separate cover)
- Project Health Rating Definitions

| G | 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). |
| Y | 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. |
| R | 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 February 2019 reporting period:
1. RSM Weekly Status Meeting (selected)
2. Daily Scrum meetings (selected)
3. Twice Weekly RSM Issues Meeting
4. Weekly CCB Meeting
5. Weekly Change Planning for Dev
6. Weekly IV&V Deliverable Reviews meeting
7. Weekly Standing IV&V Report Review meeting
8. Monthly BHA IV&V PCG-RSM Report Review meeting
9. Phase 2 Deliverables Definition Meeting
10. Executive Steering Committee Meeting
11. Phase 1 Lessons Learned Session

Artifacts reviewed during the February 2019 reporting period:
1. Daily Scrum Notes (selected)
2. Twice Weekly Targeted Questions (selected)
3. SI Project Schedule (ongoing)
4. RSM Weekly Status Reports (ongoing)
5. RSM Final Contract
6. 17-216 Schedule of Deliverables rev 02-13-19
7. P1 Iteration 7 DED
8. P1 Iteration 7 Defect Log Report
9. P1 Iteration 7 Train the Trainer Support
10. P1 Iteration 7 Day 5 IT Training
11. P1 Iteration 7 Transition Plan
12. P1 Iteration 7 Unit Test Results
13. Draft Help Desk Plan

Eclipse IV&V® Base Standards and Checklists
Appendix C: Project Trends

Trend Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Area</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements Management</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Development</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Change Management</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Open Findings</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue - high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue - medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue - low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk - high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk - medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk - low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations - high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations - medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations - low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PCG Technology Consulting
Public Focus. Proven Results.™
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Identified Date</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Reservation</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Updates</th>
<th>Project Area</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Risk Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10/31/17</td>
<td>Identify funding risk</td>
<td>2017.06.06.03</td>
<td>Federal funding risk</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Closure Reason</td>
<td>Process Area</td>
<td>09/01/17</td>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Date | RSM contract | Entity: State | Summary | findings / user stories missing the entire project) are missing required TFS 9% of the sample size (and thus, potentially identified and DOH agreed that approximately 6% of requirements to user stories, IV&V and Thornton to determine which service level agreements intended to be in the contract, IV&V recommends that the outcome of the determination is a contractually binding agreement, such as a contract amendment. | O&M to coordinate with IV&V to determine which service level agreements are necessary for the state's enterprise agreement. | O&M to work with IV&V and Thornton determine the service level agreements intended to be in the contract. IV&V recommends that the outcome of the determination is a contractually binding agreement, such as a contract amendment. | O&M to work with IV&V and Thornton determine the service level agreements intended to be in the contract. IV&V recommends that the outcome of the determination is a contractually binding agreement, such as a contract amendment. | O&M to work with IV&V and Thornton determine the service level agreements intended to be in the contract. IV&V recommends that the outcome of the determination is a contractually binding agreement, such as a contract amendment. | O&M to work with IV&V and Thornton determine the service level agreements intended to be in the contract. IV&V recommends that the outcome of the determination is a contractually binding agreement, such as a contract amendment. | O&M to work with IV&V and Thornton determine the service level agreements intended to be in the contract. IV&V recommends that the outcome of the determination is a contractually binding agreement, such as a contract amendment. | 0 & Laurie | Thornton |

| Date | 3/10/19 | This at this time, IV&V does not have an update to this finding as the state continues to wait for CMS’ response to the submitted IAPD, RAI, and PPU. | Project Management | Issue | High | Open | Significance | Darren | Status | Risk Owner |

| Date | 11/27/18 | The contract does not contain a complete and detailed reference to the state of HI’s Enterprise Agreement with Microsoft regarding service and performance levels, specifically incident and problem management, and solution millisecond response times. Due to this, there is some confusion on the project regarding the management and enforcement of contractual SLAs. Both O&M and Thornton are aware of this issue, and have agreed to work jointly to resolve the management and documentation of SLAs and to determine how service levels will be measured and enforced. | Project Management | Issue | High | Open | Significance | Darren | Status | Risk Owner |

| Date | 12/31/18 | 1/31/2019: This finding has been addressed as part of R&M reporting efforts. The work has been closed leaving this component off the risk list. | Requirements Management | Issue | High | Open | Significance | Thornton | Status | Risk Owner |
A subset of contractual performance requirements may not be included in user stories at the developed/updated Help Desk Plan.

Prior to a go-live, the BHA-ITS software must meet all contractual and performance requirements. Without this critical information documented, the state will be at risk of not being able to support customers who are experiencing issues using the new system.

RSM testing has not been planned or executed, and RSM currently does not plan to perform this set of contractual requirements.

Performance testing has not been planned or executed, and RSM currently does not plan to perform this set of contractual requirements.

The lack of ADA testing prevents the State from validating that contractual ADA requirements will be met.

All RTM and contractual requirements need to be cataloged to ensure that the Help Desk solution meets all intended business needs.

IV&V recommends that RSM work with BHA to ensure this contractual required testing is adequately planned and executed prior to GO LIVE to ensure the accessibility requirements that are not included in user stories and the BHA-ITS software solution.

IV&V recommends that RSM work with BHA to ensure this contractual required testing is adequately planned and executed prior to GO LIVE to ensure the accessibility requirements that are not included in user stories and the BHA-ITS software solution.

Final BHA IV&V Findings - February 2019 Reporting Period

48 11/2/2018 Help Desk Plan not yet developed (Lead Entity: State) Phase 1 go-live is just over 4 weeks away and the project has not developed a Help Desk / Service Plan.

As a component of the RTM validation effort, requirements to user stories (RSM identified and IV&V agreed that there are no requirements that are not included in user stories) and performance requirements have been addressed. Without planning and executing performance testing, the likelihood of performance issues is production is likely to increase. At minimum, this could result in user adoption issues based on dissatisfaction with the system. In the worst case, this could result in performance issues that could prevent users from being able to complete tasks within the system. Performance issues were reported during IV&V.

RSM submitted the requirements documentation to the State on February 8th, an adjusted date agreed to by both RSM and IV&V. As of February 27, RSM had not yet performed a detailed review of the requirements and, as a result, IV&V’s involvement in this effort remains on hold. This remains a medium risk in the February Reporting Period.

RSM has stated that this documentation is approximately 97% complete and is on target for delivery at the end of January.

IV&V was made aware that RSM and BHA agree that this documentation will now be provided in January, as a result of RSM focusing December efforts on resolving and delivering on UAT defects and requests.

1/31/2019 - DOD worked to meet to determine gaps and remediations.

1/23/2019 - DOD reviewed the Help Desk Plan has been submitted jointly by DOD and CANREAC with input from RSM.

As of the reporting period, the document has several outstanding comments and questions to be addressed. Additionally, IV&V is concerned that the Help Desk Plan does not address all of the specifications detailed in Section 1.1.1 of the contract regarding Tier staffing of Tier 2, responsibilities of state and vendor, and escalation between Tiers. IV&V is escalating to a High risk until the document is completed and approved by the project.

1/31/2019: A draft version of the Help Desk Plan has been submitted jointly by DOD and CANREAC with input from RSM. As of this reporting period, the document has several outstanding comments and questions to be addressed. Additionally, IV&V is concerned that the Help Desk Plan does not address all of the specifications detailed in Section 1.1.1 of the contract regarding Tier staffing of Tier 2, responsibilities of state and vendor, and escalation between Tiers.

As of the December 2019 Reporting Period, the project lacks a comprehensive Help Desk Plan that has been fully verified, approved, and released to RSM. Despite not having a Help Desk plan, the help desk is fully operational. As there are three different entities in charge of operating the help desk (DDO, CANREAC and RSM), and the technical expertise and experience with MS Dynamics varies amongst each team, having a comprehensive Help Desk Plan that is agreed to and approved by all parties is of significant importance. Additionally, without having documented help Desk policies and processes, there is no substantive way to gauge the process of improving help desk performance. IV&V is escalating to a High risk until the document is completed and approved by the project.

1/31/2019: As part of its Transition Readiness Assessment (TRA), IV&V reviewed the “MS Dynamics 365 WCAG” document provided by RSM to show that the MS Dynamics 365 system meets ADA Section 508 requirements. Performance testing is not performed in accordance with Section 508 of the Web Accessibility Guidelines (level 1 and 2). RSM currently cannot ensure this requirement is met. In the worst case, visually impaired users can best utilize the system. If ADA testing is not performed and any exceptions to the requirements are not tested and identified, there is risk that both solutions are not fully compliant with ADA Section 508 requirements. RSM is including the requirement that RSM perform and report on the results of the testing of the nine ADA components marked “Met with Exceptions” in the “Deliverables list” for Years 2 and 3 in the current Contract Amendment.

2/27/2019: RSM submitted the requirements documentation to the State on February 8th (an adjusted date agreed to by both RSM and IV&V). As of February 27, RSM had not yet performed a detailed review of the requirements documentation, and, as a result, IV&V’s involvement in this effort remains on hold. This remains a medium risk in the February Reporting Period.

As of the December 2019 Reporting Period, the project lacks a comprehensive Help Desk Plan that has been fully verified, approved, and released to RSM. Despite not having a Help Desk plan, the help desk is fully operational. As there are three different entities in charge of operating the help desk (DDO, CANREAC, and RSM), and the technical expertise and experience with MS Dynamics varies amongst each team, having a comprehensive Help Desk Plan that is agreed to and approved by all parties is of significant importance. Additionally, without having documented help Desk policies and processes, there is no substantive way to gauge the process of improving help desk performance. IV&V is escalating to a High risk until the document is completed and approved by the project.

1/31/2019: As part of its Transition Readiness Assessment (TRA), IV&V reviewed the “MS Dynamics 365 WCAG” document provided by RSM to show that the MS Dynamics 365 system meets ADA Section 508 requirements. Performance testing is not performed in accordance with Section 508 of the Web Accessibility Guidelines (level 1 and 2). RSM currently cannot ensure this requirement is met. In the worst case, visually impaired users can best utilize the system. If ADA testing is not performed and any exceptions to the requirements are not tested and identified, there is risk that both solutions are not fully compliant with ADA Section 508 requirements. RSM is including the requirement that RSM perform and report on the results of the testing of the nine ADA components marked “Met with Exceptions” in the “Deliverables list” for Years 2 and 3 in the current Contract Amendment.

2/27/2019: RSM submitted the requirements documentation to the State on February 8th (an adjusted date agreed to by both RSM and IV&V). As of February 27, RSM had not yet performed a detailed review of the requirements documentation, and, as a result, IV&V’s involvement in this effort remains on hold. This remains a medium risk in the February Reporting Period.

As of the December 2019 Reporting Period, the project lacks a comprehensive Help Desk Plan that has been fully verified, approved, and released to RSM. Despite not having a Help Desk plan, the help desk is fully operational. As there are three different entities in charge of operating the help desk (DDO, CANREAC, and RSM), and the technical expertise and experience with MS Dynamics varies amongst each team, having a comprehensive Help Desk Plan that is agreed to and approved by all parties is of significant importance. Additionally, without having documented help Desk policies and processes, there is no substantive way to gauge the process of improving help desk performance. IV&V is escalating to a High risk until the document is completed and approved by the project.

1/31/2019: IV&V recommends that DOH work with RSM to recommend remediation prior to GO LIVE. Without this critical information documented, the state will be at risk of not being able to support customers who are experiencing issues using the new system.

2/27/2019: IV&V recommends that DOH work with RSM to recommend remediation prior to GO LIVE.

1/31/2019: In February, RSM and BHA agreed to an acceptable ADA testing approach to be executed in the scope of P2, which has been memorialized in the “Deliverable Definitions” document that will be an input to the upcoming Contract Amendment. IV&V will continue to monitor this risk through the completion of testing, but is downgrading the risk priority to low.

1/31/2019: As part of its Transition Readiness Assessment (TRA), IV&V reviewed the “MS Dynamics 365 WCAG” document provided by RSM to show that the MS Dynamics 365 system meets ADA Section 508 requirements. Performance testing is not performed in accordance with Section 508 of the Web Accessibility Guidelines (level 1 and 2). RSM currently cannot ensure this requirement is met. In the worst case, visually impaired users can best utilize the system. If ADA testing is not performed and any exceptions to the requirements are not tested and identified, there is risk that both solutions are not fully compliant with ADA Section 508 requirements. RSM is including the requirement that RSM perform and report on the results of the testing of the nine ADA components marked “Met with Exceptions” in the “Deliverables list” for Years 2 and 3 in the current Contract Amendment.

2/27/2019: In February, RSM and BHA agreed to an acceptable ADA testing approach to be executed in the scope of P2, which has been memorialized in the “Deliverable Definitions” document that will be an input to the upcoming Contract Amendment. IV&V will continue to monitor this risk through the completion of testing, but is downgrading the risk priority to low.

1/31/2019: IV&V escalated this risk through the Transition Readiness Assessment (TRA) to both the State and RSM. RSM provided the contractual language requiring Performance Testing, and an associated results report, to both the State and RSM. RSM also did not have any further update at the moment, however continues to recommend that this testing take place, and that this remain a high risk to the situation. IV&V is including the requirement that RSM perform and report on Performance Testing in the “Deliverable list” for Years 2 and 3 in the current Contract Amendment.

1/31/2019: As of the current reporting period, the document has several outstanding comments and questions to be addressed. Additionally, IV&V is concerned that the Help Desk Plan does not address all of the specifications detailed in Section 1.1.1 of the contract regarding Tier staffing of Tier 2, responsibilities of state and vendor, and escalation between Tiers.

RSM is including the requirement that RSM perform and report on the results of the testing of the nine ADA components marked “Met with Exceptions” in the “Deliverables list” for Years 2 and 3 in the current Contract Amendment.
**Final BHA IVF Findings - February 2019 Reporting Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Identified Date</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New finding as of the January 2019 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/24/2019</td>
<td>New Finding as of the December 2018 Reporting Period.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Updates</th>
<th>Process Area</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Iteration</th>
<th>Risk Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2/28/2019</td>
<td>BHA Report Writing Responsibilities</td>
<td>A portion of the Phase 2 report writing (based on report complexity and assigned US Points) is the responsibility of BHA, with 2.25 FTE being required. BHA is currently concerned that they do not have staff with sufficient knowledge of SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS) to fulfill this task.</td>
<td>If BHA staff do not have the knowledge and/or experience with SSRS to write the needed reports and complete them when needed, there could be impacts to both DDD and CAMHD business operations, which could lead to impacts on both project and program staff.</td>
<td>BHA must determine what reports are needed by when, and develop a prioritized order for report development. Then, BHA must determine if there is a knowledge gap in developing the reports that needs to be addressed, and develop a plan to implement training before writing activities begin.</td>
<td>New preliminary concern as of the February 2019 reporting period.</td>
<td>Design &amp; Development</td>
<td>Preliminary</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Brian Nagy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>