

DAVID Y. IGE
GOVERNOR



TODD NACAPUY
CHIEF INFORMATION
OFFICER

OFFICE OF ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

P.O. BOX 119, HONOLULU, HAWAII 96810-0119
Ph: (808) 586-6000 | Fax: (808) 586-1922
ETS.HAWAII.GOV

March 18, 2019

The Honorable Ronald D. Kouchi,
President, and
Members of The Senate
Twenty-Ninth State Legislature
Hawaii State Capitol, Room 409
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

The Honorable Scott K. Saiki,
Speaker, and
Members of The House of Representatives
Twenty-Ninth State Legislature
Hawaii State Capitol, Room 431
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear President Kouchi, Speaker Saiki, and Members of the Legislature:

Pursuant to HRS section 27-43.6, which requires the Chief Information Officer to submit applicable independent verification and validation (IV&V) reports to the Legislature within ten days of receiving the report, please find attached the IV&V report the Office of Enterprise Technology Services received for the State of Hawaii Department of Human Services Systems Modernization Project.

In accordance with HRS section 93-16, this report may be viewed electronically at <http://ets.hawaii.gov> (see "Reports").

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MURDOCK
Chief Information Officer
State of Hawai'i

Attachment (2)



Hawaii Department of Human Services Systems Modernization Project

Final IV&V Monthly Status Report
For Reporting Period: January 1 – 31, 2019

Final submitted: February 8, 2019

Overview

- [Executive Summary](#)
- [IV&V Findings and Recommendations](#)
- [IV&V Engagement Status](#)
- [Appendices](#)
 - [A – IV&V Criticality Ratings](#)
 - [B – Risk Identification Report](#)
 - [C – Acronyms and Glossary](#)
 - [D – Background Information](#)



Executive Summary

Executive Summary



Overall, IV&V assessed the category of Project Management at a High criticality rating due to the slow rate of progress and the continued churn in establishing project management processes and rigor. Key project management artifacts such as the Project Management Plan and Project Schedule remain incomplete, although IV&V acknowledges that incremental progress has been made. IV&V assessed a Medium criticality in the category of Configuration and Development. The Joint Application Design (JAD) framework previously established by the ASI was not tenable for DHS. DHS placed a hold on JAD sessions, and the ASI has developed a Process Improvement Plan (PIP) to resolve the problems. One new finding in the category of project management was opened during this reporting period. Several IV&V findings remain open in the areas of project management and configuration and development, which are summarized at a high level below and discussed more in-depth in the Findings and Recommendations section of this report.

Nov	Dec	Jan	Category	IV&V Observations
M	H	H	Project Management	<p>During this reporting period the IV&V team noted continuing incremental progress in strengthening project management discipline. Notably, the Project Management Plan (PMP) draft, along with subordinate plans, was submitted and is in the review process.</p> <p>The project schedule has not been fully baselined nor approved; which obscures identification of genuinely late critical tasks. Among these tasks are the submission of project deliverables. Deliverable delays (both in terms of submission and approvals) pose a negative risk to the project schedule, however, the lack of an approved, fully baselined schedule constrains effective quantification of the risk.</p> <p>The project team continues to experience a high degree of churn (i.e., repeated discussions and confusion) as it establishes project management activities. Project status reporting has undergone some modifications to better gauge the health of the project, however, further modifications are needed to finalize the format and content. The collective body of findings related to project management, and the relative slowness in progress continue to warrant an overall criticality rating of High for this category.</p>

Continued on following page

Executive Summary (cont.)



Nov	Dec	Jan	Category	IV&V Observations
M	M	M	Configuration and Development	The Configuration and Development findings continue to focus on the Project's inability to reach an understanding between DHS and its vendors (ASI and/or Enterprise Systems Integrator [ESI]) on preferred tools, solutions (e.g., business intelligence and portal development), and environments to support DDI. The number of Siebel instances and the necessary development environments are the primary drivers of risk in this category. The ASI has stated that if the DEV2 environment is not available by February 12, the project schedule will be delayed. Additionally, the ASI has stated that a decision on the use of portal development code will impede their ability to appropriately staff the project and delay the schedule. As noted above, without a fully baselined, approved project schedule, actual impact to the schedule cannot be determined at this time.


IV&V Findings and Recommendations




IV&V Findings and Recommendations

As of this reporting period, PCG has identified a total of 16 open findings (0 issues, 16 risks) and 1 retired finding. Of the open findings, 11 are related to Project Management and 5 are related to Configuration and Development. One new finding was recorded during the period. The following figures provide a breakdown of our open findings by priority and category.

Open Findings by Category/Priority




Open Risks/Issues by Category





IV&V Findings and Recommendations

The following figure provides a breakdown of all IV&V findings by status (open, retired).





IV&V Findings and Recommendations

New Findings During the Reporting Period

#	Finding	Category
17	The Project may experience the situation where several deliverables may be presented to DHS for review and approval within a short period of time, which may cause schedule delays.	Project Management



IV&V Findings and Recommendations

Closed Findings During the Reporting Period

#	Finding	Category
	No findings were closed during this reporting period.	



IV&V Findings and Recommendations

H Project Management

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
1	<p>Risk – Current project management techniques in the JAR and JAD sessions may negatively impact system design. In early January, DHS placed JAD sessions on hold, excepting those for which travel from neighboring islands had been planned, pending a plan to improve JAD session planning and delivery. The ASI presented a draft of their Process Improvement Plan (PIP) for the conduct of JAD's, including timing, attendees, input and outputs, and presented it to DHS and IV&V on 1/14/2019. DHS and the ASI worked jointly to refine the PIP. The ASI presented their 3rd iteration of the Process Improvement Plans for JADs on 1/23, which should provide improvements in overall JAD planning and structuring of associated outputs. IV&V assessed the draft BES JAD Schedule Management Process, Document Change Management Process, and RTM Mapping to JAD Topics outputs, and all three documents indicated that previously identified JAD issues could be addressed by these incremental changes. Additional process changes and documentation are now planned for delivery by 2/4.</p> <p>In January, JADs relating to docked policy items had not yet been held.</p>	M

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Implement project management best practices and identify opportunities to improve meeting management techniques. Publish/post missing JAR/JAD session notes on SharePoint, and moving forward, publish notes within a reasonable period of time (e.g., 24 hrs) after completion of any given session.	In Process



IV&V Findings and Recommendations

Project Management

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
2	<p>Risk – Late Delivery of project deliverables may result in schedule delays. The ASI submitted 19 artifacts (17 DEDs and 2 Deliverables) for review in January. Notably, the Draft Project Management Plan (PMP) - which consists of a base project management plan and multiple sub-plans - was submitted for review by DHS and IV&V.</p> <p>The project schedule lacks baseline dates for many tasks, and there is no evidence that the project schedule deliverable has been approved. A project schedule is posted weekly, however, a review of the weekly project schedule shows that it has not been updated (i.e., percent complete, actual start and/or finish dates, et al). Delays in achieving approved DEDs may necessitate that the project schedule be re-evaluated (baselined for tasks lacking baseline dates; re-baselined for tasks containing proposed baseline dates). The PMP included a proposed Deliverable Review process, and the PMO has also proposed a Deliverable Review process. The final Deliverable Review Process has not yet been finalized. This finding remains at a High criticality for January.</p>	

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Review the project schedule to capture and discuss the late deliverables and delivery thereof; complete the Project Management Plan and deliver it for review to DHS and IV&V for review; attain approval of the PMP.	In Process

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Project Management

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
3	Risk – Project Status Reporting does not meet with expectations or Best Practices for presenting status updates of schedule, cost, scope, risks, issues, and change management, which may inhibit effective project management and limit project transparency. During this reporting period, IV&V observed Unisys and DHS refining the Weekly Status Report through a series of incremental changes. The State and the ASI continue to close the status reporting gaps. The risk remains a High priority for resolution pending a baselined project schedule and finalization of project status reporting.	
4	Risk – An unclear deliverable review and acceptance process may be contributing to project delays. Both the ASI and DHS proposed deliverable review and approval processes in January. The DHS PMO and BES Project Manager drafted a deliverable review/approval process that includes the PMO preferred Deliverable Comment Form (DCF) to aggregate reviewer comments. The ASI included a deliverable review/approval process along with an alternate comment form within the draft PMP. The DHS PMO is working with the ASI to determine the process to be implemented and, when agreed upon, roll-out to the Project Team.	

Recommendations	Progress
Meet jointly (DHS, the ASI, and IV&V) to determine revisions to the Project Status Report that would meet the needs of reporting on all active tasks and activities, and eliminate redundancy between the data contained in the Project Status Reports and SharePoint logs.	In Process
Develop a deliverable review and acceptance process that clarifies to whom the deliverables are to be submitted, how the deliverables are to be provided, how the recipients are to be notified (e.g., SharePoint alert or email notification), and when review comments are due in order to finalize the deliverables on a timely basis. Include this process in the PMP.	In Process



IV&V Findings and Recommendations

Project Management

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
5	Risk – The Project Partnership Understanding (PPU) for the BES Project has not been approved by CMS, which may impact the project schedule and funding. On December 17, 2018, the State submitted the PPU to CMS for their review and approval. No comments from CMS were received in January.	
6	Risk – The BES Risk and Issues Log lacks necessary data elements, which are needed to afford complete transparency. Late in the month (1/29), the Project decided to use an Excel workbook developed by the ASI for the Project Risk and Issue Log. IV&V will review and assess the new risk and issue log in early February to determine if all recommended elements for risk and issue tracking have been included.	

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit the updated PPU to CMS for review and approval; determine the impact of CMS' decisions on the Project and incorporate all federal reporting and process requirements into the appropriate project deliverables. 	In process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet (DHS, ASI, IV&V) to determine all elements needed to support the Risk and Issue Management processes. Following that activity, update the Risk and Issues log to reflect all agreed-upon elements. 	In Process



IV&V Findings and Recommendations

Project Management

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
7	Risk – The Change Management Process is not fully documented and approved, which could delay Change Requests and affect scope, schedule, cost, and quality. The ASI updated the Change Management Plan sub component of the PMP, and delivered it as a draft. IV&V is in process of review and assessment of all PMP sub plans, with comments and recommendations to be provided in early February. The risk remains open at a Medium criticality pending finalization of the Plan.	
9	Risk – BESSD leads and/or teams have not been assigned to the Project, which negatively impacts the schedule and workload. JAD sessions were placed on hold in January. This risk remain open pending resumption of JAD sessions and observation of the results of the BES staffing assignments made in late December.	

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none">ASI complete the development of the Change Management Plan and collaborate with DHS to ensure the process is institutionalized for the BES Project.	In Process
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Identify high-priority areas where BESSD Leads are needed and obtain executive level support to reallocate BESSD staff to the project soon as possible. Re-assess the need for support throughout the project life cycle to ensure that the appropriate subject matter experts are available as required.	In Process



IV&V Findings and Recommendations

Project Management

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
14	Risk – The Decision Log process is undefined, which may hamper communication and discovery of Project Decisions. Review of the draft PMP is underway, however the Decision Log process was not found in the initial review of the PMP.	
15	Risk – The Decision Log lacks data elements needed for tracking and reporting on key Project Decisions, which may hamper discovery of decisions. Review of the draft PMP is underway, however Decision Log elements were not found in the initial review of the PMP.	

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none">DHS, the ASI, and IV&V meet to determine the parameters that will be used to identify the level and types of decisions that will be entered in the log. This information should then be recorded in the Project Management Plan, Communications Plan, or other appropriate document/artifact.	Not started
<ul style="list-style-type: none">DHS, the ASI, and IV&V meet to determine all elements needed to support the Decision Log and associated processes. Following that activity, IV&V recommends that the DHS SharePoint Decisions log is updated to reflect all agreed-to needed elements and decisions.	Not started



IV&V Findings and Recommendations

Configuration and Development

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
17	Risk – The Project may experience the situation where several deliverables may be presented to DHS for review and approval within a short period of time, which may cause schedule delays. The lack of a deliverable review process, delays occurring in the DED review and approval process and final approved DED's may result in the ASI to submitting multiple deliverables for review/approval at the same time or within a short time frame. Following the early identification of this risk, DHS, ASI and IV&V met to gain a better understanding of revised deliverable schedule. The ASI has not published an updated schedule (as of the end of January), therefore it is unknown at this point when the project deliverables will be available for review. An unusually high number of deliverables submitted for review in the same general time frame may be more than available State staff are able to process in desired review cycle times. This will in turn cause new delays in approvals of the submitted deliverables; increasing the risk for negative project schedule impact.	

Recommendations	Progress
Options to mitigate the risk include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prioritizing the deliverables to identify those that should be reviewed first based on the criteria of schedule impact and/or cross-deliverable integration;• Review of interim drafts;• Addition of DHS resources to review/approve deliverables;• Addition of DHS review time for the larger deliverables; and/or• Adopt an option of 'conditional' approval with specific criteria that must be met to achieve final approval.	Not started

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



M Configuration and Development

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
10	Risk – The number of instances of Siebel to be implemented for BES Project is undecided, which may impact the project schedule and project costs. In January, the ASI provided DHS with Use Cases which DHS has reviewed. DHS will determine whether a Change Request (CR) will be submitted to develop Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) pricing and schedule impacts for a single instance. This risk remains open with high criticality due to increasingly high potential for rework the longer the decision is pending.	H
11	Risk – Changes in direction regarding the preferred business intelligence (BI)/reporting tool may impact project schedule and cost. In December, a Final CR was initiated by DHS but has not yet been provided to Unisys to start the change management process. The status of the CR remains unchanged in January. This low criticality risk remains open pending completion of the CR process.	L

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work collaboratively (DHS, ASI and ESI) to develop a long term infrastructure strategy along with 5+ year ROI, cost/benefit, license strategy, and risk proposition that includes an assessment of a single vs. dual instance assessment. Record the decision in the Decision Log – even if the decision remains within project scope – to memorialize the outcome and alleviate the impact of the topic resurfacing later. 	In Process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete the CR process to obtain a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) estimate and/or impact analysis as appropriate. 	In Process



IV&V Findings and Recommendations

M Configuration and Development

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
12	Risk – Changes in direction regarding the preferred platform for portal development may impact project schedule and cost. A project impact assessment is being created by the ASI. ASI has estimated annual license costs for LifeRay to be \$80k/yr. and Adobe at \$140k/yr. This low criticality risk remains open pending completion of the CR process.	
13	Risk – Differing ASI and ESI expectations regarding DDI environments may impact project schedule and cost. This risk was also logged by the Project on 12/5. The Project has since escalated the risk to an Issue. The ASI stated on 1/30 that the DEV2 environment is required by 2/12 to avoid detrimental impact to the start of development. Discussions have taken place with DHS leadership concerning provision of the environment, however final decisions have not been made. Alternatives being evaluated include an Oracle cloud-based solution (7-8 weeks from order to be ready), an ESI on-premise solution (3-4 weeks to be ready), or a Unisys solution using the AWS Cloud (3-4 weeks to be ready). Further, there seems to be a lack of good communication around the urgency of the need for the DEV2 environment as OIT (the State entity managing the ESI vendor) was unaware of the criticality. This risk remains open at high criticality.	
Recommendations		Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete the CR process to obtain a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) estimate and/or impact analysis as appropriate. 		In Process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ASI work with the State to reach a common understanding of the requirements for the BES DDI environments. ESI and ASI work together to formulate an environment strategy that will meet the project platform and development needs and minimize impact to the State. 		In Process



IV&V Findings and Recommendations

Configuration and Development

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
16	Risk – Lack of clear understanding of SI DDI approach may reduce effectiveness of JARs and JADs. There remains some confusion over what the ASI has agreed to do to increase understanding of the overall ASI DDI approach for DHS leadership and JAD participants. The ASI produced a DDI Plan (BI-06) DED and received feedback/comments. Their response to the deliverable comment form (DCF) comments has not yet been provided to DHS. The ASI has begun execution of a process improvement plan (PIP) that includes providing some DDI approach information in JAD packets sent to JAD participants prior to JAD sessions. DHS leadership continues to state that they remain unclear on the SI's DDI approach.	

Recommendations	Progress
PCG recommends one or more of the following to mitigate this risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SI provide an additional DDI approach overview session for stakeholders and allow for Q&A• SI provide DDI approach documentation/materials for stakeholders to review and/or refresh their knowledge on demand; the materials could be made available via the project SharePoint• SI and DHS accelerate review, resubmission and approval of an acceptable DDI Plan DED to facilitate submission of DDI Plan deliverable• SI submit DDI Plan deliverable and make it easily available to all project stakeholders	In Process

IV&V Status



IV&V Engagement Status

IV&V Engagement Area	Nov	Dec	Jan	Comments
IV&V Budget				
IV&V Schedule				
IV&V Deliverables				
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) IV&V Progress Reports				The first quarterly CMS Eligibility and Enrollment (E&E) IV&V Progress Report is now expected at the end of March 2019 (refer to the PPU submitted to CMS).
CMS Milestone Reviews				The first CMS Milestone Review date has not yet been determined.
IV&V Staffing				
IV&V Scope				

Engagement Rating Legend



The engagement area is within acceptable parameters.



The engagement area is somewhat outside acceptable parameters.



The engagement area poses a significant risk to the IV&V project quality and requires immediate attention.



IV&V Activities

- IV&V activities in monthly reporting period:
 - Completed – December Monthly Status Report
 - Submitted – ASI M&O Assessment Report
 - Work In Process – ESI M&O Progress Assessment
 - Performed preliminary analysis of Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Toolkit (MEET) requirements applicable to BES project
 - Ongoing – Observe BES JAD sessions
 - Ongoing – Review DEDs and Deliverables for BES project
 - Ongoing – Attend ASI project meetings (see [Additional Inputs](#) pages for details)
- Planned IV&V activities for next reporting period:
 - ESI M&O Progress Assessment
 - Discuss results of preliminary analysis of Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Toolkit (MEET) requirements applicable to BES project with DHS PMO and BES Project Director
 - Ongoing – Observe BES JAD sessions
 - Ongoing – Observe Weekly Project Status meetings
 - Ongoing – Observe bi-weekly BES Project Risk and Issue meetings
 - Ongoing – Participate in weekly DHS and IV&V Touch Base meetings
 - Ongoing – Review BES artifacts and deliverables

Deliverables Reviewed



Deliverable Name	Deliverable Date	Version
BI-02 Project Status Report deliverable (Weekly)	01/01/2019 01/08/2019 01/15/2019 01/22/2019 01/29/2019	
BI-02 Project Status Report DED Re-Assessment	01/07/2019	v1.2
BI-02 Project Status Report DED Re-Assessment #2	01/10/2019	v1.3
BI-04 Project Management Plan DED Re-Assessment	01/04/2019	v1.0
BI-04 Project Management Plan Deliverable - Issue and Risk Management Sub-Plan	01/17/2019	Draft
BI-04 Project Management Plan Deliverable – Base Document	01/30/2019	Draft
BI-04 Project Management Plan Deliverable – Budget/Cost Management Sub-Plan	01/30/2019	Draft
BI-04 Project Management Plan Deliverable - Change Management Sub-Plan	01/16/2019	Draft
BI-04 Project Management Plan Deliverable – Human Resources Management Sub-Plan	01/31/2019	Draft
BI-04 Project Management Plan Deliverable – Issue and Risk Management Sub-Plan	01/17/2019 01/31/2019	Draft
BI-04 Project Management Plan Deliverable – Procurement Management Sub-Plan	01/31/2019	Draft
BI-04 Project Management Plan Deliverable – Scope Management Sub-Plan	01/24/2019	Draft

Deliverables Reviewed



Deliverable Name	Deliverable Date	Version
BI-05 Project Schedule DED Re-Assessment	01/07/2019	v1.0
BI-05 Project Schedule Deliverable (Weekly)	01/01/2019 01/08/2019 01/15/2019 01/22/2019 01/29/2019	
BI-08 Technical Environments Specification DED RE-Assessment	01/07/2019	v0.9
BI-08 Technical Environments Specification DED RE-Assessment #2	01/10/2019	v1.0
BI-09 Updated and Validated BPA Document and RTM DED Re-Assessment	01/29/2019	v1.1
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document DED Re-Assessment	01/29/2019	v1.1
BI-12 System Architecture DED Re-Assessment	01/04/2019	v2.0
BI-12 System Architecture DED Re-Assessment #2	01/24/2019	v3.0
BI-14 Technical Design Document DED Re-Assessment	01/07/2019	v1.5
BI-15 Fully Configured and Developed System DED Re-Assessment	01/04/2019	v.02
BI-15 Fully Configured and Developed System DED Re-Assessment #2	01/24/2019	v1.0
BI-23 Stakeholder Analysis Report DED Re-Assessment	01/04/2019	V2.0

Deliverables Reviewed



Deliverable Name	Deliverable Date	Version
BI-26 Training Course Catalog DED Re-Assessment	01/04/2019	v1.0
BI-26 Training Course Catalog DED Re-Assessment #2	01/10/2019	v1.1
BI-27 Training Manuals, End-User Guides, and Materials DED Re-Assessment	01/04/2019	v1.0
BI-27 Training Manuals, End-User Guides, and Materials DED Re-Assessment #2	01/10/2019	v1.1
BI-28 Documented Evidence of Successful End-User Training	01/04/2019	V1.1
BI-29 Roll Out Plan DED Re-Assessment	01/04/2019	v1.1
BI-29 Roll Out Plan DED Re-Assessment #2	01/10/2019	v1.2
BI-30 Pilot Evaluation Report DED Re-Assessment	01/04/2019	v1.1
BI-31 Deployment Plan DED Re-Assessment	01/04/2019	v1.1
BI-31 Deployment Plan DED Re-Assessment #2	01/10/2019	v1.2
BI-32 Formal System Acceptance DED Re-Assessment	01/04/2019	v1.0
BI-33 Completion of All Warranty Activities Report DED Re-Assessment	01/04/2019	v1.1
BI-34 Monthly OCM Report DED Re-Assessment	01/04/2019	v3.0



Additional Inputs – Artifacts

Artifact Name	Artifact Date	Version
DHS and Unisys Deliverable Review Process	01/17/2019 01/24/2019	
JAD Information and Schedules Packets – SSP 1	01/07/2019	
JAD Information and Schedules Packets – CORE 3	01/25/2019	
JAD Process Improvement Plan – Document Change Management Plan	01/23/2019	
JAD Process Improvement Plan – JAD Schedule Management Plan	01/23/2019	
JAD Process Improvement Plan – RTM Mapping Functional Requirements to JADs	01/23/2019	
BES OCM Workgroup Meeting 20190124 revised – PPT	01/24/2019	
BES Project Risk and Issue Log (SharePoint) and (Excel Spreadsheet)	N/A	
BES Project Decision Log (SharePoint)	N/A	
DHS-OCM Project Charter	Draft	V1

Additional Inputs



- **Meetings and/or Sessions Attended/Observed:**
- SSP 1 JADs (Weeks of 1/7 and 1/14)
- Eligibility JADs (Weeks of 1/7 and 1/14)
- Core JAD 3 (Weeks of 1/21 and 1/28)
- Project Risk and Issue Meetings (Jan 16, Jan 23)
- Change Control Bi-Weekly (Jan 16, Jan 23)
- BES Weekly Project Status Meetings (Jan 2, Jan 9, Jan 16, Jan 23, Jan 30)
- BESSD, DHS PMO, IV&V Meeting (Jan 2, Jan 9, Jan 16, Jan 23, Jan 30, Jan 31)
- Internal Team Meetings (Jan 3, Jan 4, Jan 7, Jan 14, Jan 21, Jan 28)
- JAD Process Improvement Plan Meetings (Jan 14, Jan 17, Jan 23)
- DED Approval / Working Meeting (Jan 3)
- Finalize Status Report Format (Jan 4)
- Enterprise Operations Committee Meeting – (Jan 10, Jan 24)
- Enterprise Steering Committee – (Jan 17)

Appendices



Appendix A – IV&V Criticality Ratings

Criticality Rating	Definition
 H	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.
 M	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 evaluated and implemented as soon as feasible.
 L	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.

Appendix B – Findings Log



- The complete Findings Log for the BES Project is provided in a separate file.

Appendix C – Acronyms and Glossary



Acronym	Definition
APD	Advance Planning Document
ASI	Application System Integrator
BES	Benefits Eligibility Solution
CCWIS	Comprehensive Child Welfare Information System
CM	Configuration Management
CMMI	Capability Maturity Model Integration
CMS	Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services
CR	Change Request
DDI	Design, Development and Implementation
DED	Deliverable Expectation Document
DHS	Hawaii Department of Human Services
DLV	Deliverable
E&E	Eligibility and Enrollment
EA	Enterprise Architecture
ECM	Enterprise Content Management (FileNet and DataCap)
ESI	Enterprise System Integrator (Platform Vendor)
ETS	State of Hawaii Office of Enterprise Technology Services
FIPS	Federal Information Processing Standard
HIPAA	Health Information Portability and Accountability Act of 1996
IDM	Identity and Access Management (from KOLEA to State Hub)
IEEE	Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
IES	Integrated Eligibility Solution
ITIL	Information Technology Infrastructure Library

Appendix C – Acronyms and Glossary



Acronym	Definition
IV&V	Independent Verification and Validation
KOLEA	Kauhale On-Line Eligibility Assistance
M&O	Maintenance & Operations
MEELC	Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Life Cycle
MEET	Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Toolkit
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MQD	Hawaii Department of Human Services MedQuest Division
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
OE	Operating Environment
OIT	Department of Human Services Office of Information Technology
PIP	Performance/Process Improvement Plan
PMBOK®	Project Management Body of Knowledge
PMI	Project Management Institute
PMO	Project/Program Management Office
PMP	Project Management Plan
QA	Quality Assurance
QM	Quality Management
RFP	Request for Proposal
ROM	Rough Order of Magnitude
RMP	Requirements Management Plan
RTM	Requirements Traceability Matrix
SEI	Software Engineering Institute
SLA	Service-Level Agreement
SME	Subject Matter Expert

Appendix C – Acronyms and Glossary



Acronym	Definition
SOA	Service Oriented Architecture
SOW	Statement of Work, Scope of Work
VVP	Software Verification and Validation Plan
XLC	Expedited Life Cycle

Appendix D – Background Information



Systems Modernization Project

The DHS Enterprise Program Roadmap includes contracting with three separate vendors with the following high-level scope:

- ESI or Platform Vendor – responsible for the shared technology and services required for multiple Application vendors to implement and support functionality that leverages the DHS Enterprise Platform.
- ASI or ASI Vendor – responsible for the DDI of the Benefits Eligibility Solution (BES Project) enhancing the currently implemented Medicaid E&E Solution (KOLEA) and providing support for the combined Solutions.
- CCWIS Vendor – responsible for the DDI of the CCWIS Solution to meet the needs of child welfare services and adult protective services (CCWIS Project) and providing support for the Solution.

Systems Modernization IV&V Project

IV&V performs objective assessments of the design, development/configuration and implementation (DDI) of DHS' System Modernization Projects. DHS has identified three high-risk areas where IV&V services are required:

- Transition of M&O from DHS' incumbent vendor to the ESI and ASI vendors
- BES DDI
- CCWIS DDI

On the BES DDI Project, IV&V is responsible for:

- Evaluating efforts performed by the Project (processes, methods, activities) for consistency with federal requirements and industry best practices and standards
- Reviewing or validating the work effort performed and deliverables produced by the ASI vendor as well as that of DHS to ensure alignment with project requirements
- Anticipating project risks, monitoring project issues and risks, and recommending potential risk mitigation strategies and issue resolutions throughout the project's life cycle
- Developing and providing independent project oversight reports to DHS, ASI vendors, State of Hawaii Office of Enterprise Technology Services (ETS) and DHS' Federal partners

Appendix D – Background Information



What is Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V)?

- Oversight by an independent third party that assesses the project against industry standards to provide an unbiased view to stakeholders
- The goal of IV&V is to help the State get the solution they want based on requirements and have it built according to best practices
- IV&V helps improve design visibility and traceability and identifies (potential) problems early
- IV&V objectively identifies risks and communicates to project leadership for risk management

PCG's Eclipse IV&V® Methodology

- Consists of a 4-part process made up of the following areas:
 1. **Discovery** – Discovery consists of reviewing documentation, work products and deliverables, interviewing project team members, and determining applicable standards, best practices and tools.
 2. **Research and Analysis** – Research and analysis is conducted in order to form an objective opinion.
 3. **Clarification** – Clarification from project team members is sought to ensure agreement and concurrence of facts between the State, the Vendor, and PCG.
 4. **Delivery of Findings** – Findings, observations, and risk assessments are documented in this monthly report and the accompanying Findings and Recommendations log. These documents are then shared with project leadership on both the State and Vendor side for them to consider and take appropriate action on.

IV&V Assessment Categories for the BES Project

- Project Management
- Requirements Analysis & Management
- System Design
- Configuration and Development
- Integration and Interface Management
- Security and Privacy
- Testing
- OCM and Knowledge Transfer
- Pilot Test Deployment
- Deployment



www.publicconsultinggroup.com

No.	Title	Finding Type	Identified Date	Date Retired	Category	Source	Observation	Significance	Recommendation	Event Horizon	Impact	Probability	Priority	Analyst	Prk Finding Sta	Status Update	Client Comments	Vendor Comments	Project Risk Sta	Project Risk Ow
1	Current project management techniques in the JAR and JAD sessions may negatively impact system design	Finding - Risk	10/31/2018		Project Manager	Observation	<p>Finding: IV&V has observed weak meeting facilitation skills and noted that meeting minutes or notes from all of the Joint Application Review (JAR) and Joint application Design (JAD) sessions are not posted on the BES SharePoint site.</p> <p>General Observation from October reporting period: During requirements validation, all Policy requirements were 'docked', or tabled, for further research and discussion. It is unclear whether Policy requirements should be met within the BES solution, or outside of the BES solution. How the requirements and processes for Preliminary Eligibility requirements can or should be satisfied within BES is a large process change for DHS. It was clear during requirements validation that there was not agreement on how this should work within BES and DHS, so all Preliminary Eligibility requirements were docked for further research.</p>	If JAR and JAD notes are not consistently posted, session participants are unable to validate if input has been accurately recorded, potentially affecting BES system functionality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement project management best practices and identify opportunities to improve meeting management techniques. Publish/post missing JAR/JAD session notes on SharePoint, and moving forward, publish notes within a reasonable period of time (e.g., 24 hrs) after completion of any given session. 	Q1 2019	3	3	Medium	Med	Open	01/29/2019 - The ASI presented their 3rd iteration of the Process Improvement Plans for JADs on 1/23, which should provide improvements in overall JAD planning and structuring of associated outputs. IV&V assessed the draft BES JAD Schedule Management Process, Document Change Management Process, and RIM Mapping to JAD Topics outputs, and all three documents indicated that previously identified JAD issues could be addressed by these incremental changes. Additional process changes and documentation are now planned for delivery by 2/4. 01/16/2019 - In early January, DHS placed JAD sessions on hold, excepting those for which travel from neighboring islands had been planned, pending a plan to improve JAD session planning and delivery. The ASI presented the draft of their Process Improvement Plan (PIP) for the conduct of JAD's, including timing, attendees, input and outputs, and presented it to DHS and IVV on 1/14/2019. Since the PIP did not directly answer address all open items, DHS and the ASI scheduled a workshop for 1/17/19 to drive the PIP deeper. 12/31/18: The JADs relating to the docked items have not yet been held. IVV observed that some JAR and JAD notes have been published, however all have not yet been documented and published. Robert Plummer was brought on board in				
2	Late delivery of project deliverables may result in schedule delays.	Finding - Risk	11/28/2018		Project Management		Based upon the project schedule dated 11/26/18 (refer to schedule for specifics), several due dates for project deliverables have been missed. As of the date of this report, these deliverables include the Project Management Plan (PMP), which is the formal document that is used to manage the execution of the project. In some instances, this risk may be compounded by a backlog of Deliverable Expectation Documents (DED) requiring approval and acceptance from the State.	Without a PMP that depicts all Project Management processes, the Project can suffer unplanned consequences in scope, schedule, cost, and quality parameters.	IVV recommends that the ASI works to complete the Project Management Plan deliverable, work with DHS and IV&V for review and edit as needed, and attain approval of the PMP. This will help ensure that all processes within the project management entity are thoughtfully and collaboratively developed and implemented to meet the needs of the project. Review the project schedule to capture and discuss the late deliverables and delivery thereof; complete the Project Management Plan and deliver it for review to DHS and IV&V for review; attain approval of the PMP.	TBD	4	3	High	High	Open	1/31/2019 - The ASI delivered the Draft PMP for review by DHS and IVV. The project schedule has not been updated and the Deliverable Review Process has not been finalized. The project schedule lacks baseline dates for many tasks, and there is no evidence that the project schedule deliverable has been approved. A project schedule is posted weekly, however, a review of the weekly project schedule shows that it has not been updated (i.e., percent complete, actual start and/or finish dates, et al). Delays in achieving approved DEDs may necessitate that the project schedule be re-evaluated (baselined for tasks lacking baseline dates; re-baselined for tasks containing proposed baseline dates). 12/31/2018: The ASI acknowledges the late delivery issues which are compounded by the lack of a defined deliverable review and acceptance with the ASI, DHS and IVV. The ASI is currently working on updating the schedule and DHS is actively working on the defined process to review/accept deliverables. 12/6/18: Our collective experience is that we have seen more than one project where delayed deliverables have a 'snowball' effect that sometimes has resulted in disruption. The schedule is impacted and it could result in a project delay. One approach to mitigation would be to re-schedule the deliverables such that a project delay would not	2/6/19, Bill Thornton, Unisys: Executive Summary Risks Feedback The project schedule has been baselined but it needs to be re-baselined based on the approval dates of the DED's. Deliverable delays – as deliverables are not supposed to be started until the DED is approved, the deliverables are not delayed, they need to be re-baselined based on the DED approval. Findings and Recommendations (#2) – Project Management ASI submitted 19 deliverables and DEDs – Clarification - there were 2 deliverables submitted (B-8 Technical specs for the non-prod environments and B1-4 the PMP) – the rest were DEDs Deliverable Review process has not been finalized – this is part of the PMP document Late deliverables – as deliverables are not supposed to be started until the DED is approved, the deliverables are not delayed, they need to be re-baselined based on the DED approval 12/6/18, Keith Stock, Unisys: 2) We don't disagree with the statements but assigning this high which states "a major disruption is likely and the consequences would be unacceptable" seems inappropriate.			
3	Project Status Reporting does not meet with expectations or Best Practices for presenting status updates of schedule, cost, scope, risks, issues, and change management, which may inhibit effective project management and limit project transparency.	Finding - Risk	11/19/2018		Project Manager	Observation	Although the Project Status Report follows the RFP requirements, IV&V has observed that the Status Report does not list/track of all of the current project tasks and activities, and appears to primarily reflect tasks and activities requiring DHS participation. Additionally, the content of the Project Status Report in some areas (e.g., risks and issues) is redundant to BES SharePoint Log. Examples include: 1. The Project Status Report does not include tracking of ALL current tasks and activities. It appears to largely be limited to only tasks and activities requiring DHS participation. 2. The Project Status Report includes multiple sections for Risks and Issues, which are redundant to a corollary SharePoint Risk and Issue Log. 3. All current 'Issues' cited in the Status Report are incorrectly listed as 'Risks' in the Risk and Issues Log on SharePoint.	Reporting Project Status on some, but not all, areas of the project provides an incomplete understanding of the status of the entire project. A complete understanding is necessary to ensure that scope, cost, and schedule parameters are all being met across the project.	IVV recommends that DHS, the ASI, and IVV jointly determine revisions to the Project Status Report that would meet the needs of reporting on all active tasks and activities, and that redundancy between the data contained in the Project Status Reports and the SharePoint logs is removed.	February 2019	5	3	High	High	Open	01/29/2019 - During this reporting period, IV&V observed Unisys and DHS refining incremental changes made to the Status Report on a weekly basis. The State and the ASI are in process of closing these reporting gaps. The risk remains a High priority for resolution pending a baselined project schedule and finalization of project status reporting. 12/31/18: IV&V observed and contributed to continued discussions in weekly Status Meetings surrounding upcoming changes to the Weekly Status Report. Unisys has made small, incremental changes to the report, however these changes have not met with DHS satisfaction and additional status reporting changes are still needed. The meeting to discuss and revise is anticipated to be held in early January. Further, the project schedule has not yet been baselined and it is generally known that the dates in the schedule require adjustment. The risk is raised to a High priority for resolution due to the relative lack of progress, lack of a baselined project schedule, reduced project transparency, and potential downstream impacts resulting from incomplete project status reporting. 12/06/2018: IV&V recognizes that the ASI and the State agree that changes need to be made to the Status Report. A meeting to review, discuss, and update accordingly is expected to take place during	2/6/19, Bill Thornton, Unisys: Findings and Recommendations (#3) – Project Management Status reporting – The original status report adhered to the DED – it has been adjusted multiple times based on feedback. 12/6/18, Keith Stock, Unisys: 3) Status report structure is dictated by the RFP. There is an ongoing action item to modify structure and content by mutual agreement			
4	An unclear deliverable review and acceptance process may be contributing to project delays.	Finding - Risk	11/28/2018		Project Management		Project processes for delivering, noticing and reviewing project deliverables are unclear. In order to identify whether a deliverable is available for review, the IV&V team must review the project schedule and check for deliverable postings to SharePoint. While the ASI may be submitting deliverables to the BES Project Manager, neither the IV&V team nor the PMO are notified. As a result, review cycle-times may be missed and deliverable acceptance can be delayed, which may inhibit the ASI's ability to move forward on future tasks.	An unclear deliverable review and approval cycle can lead to project delays.	Finalize the deliverable review and acceptance process that clarifies to whom the deliverables are to be submitted, how the deliverables are to be provided, how the recipients are to be notified (e.g., SharePoint alert or email notification), and when review comments are due in order to finalize the deliverables on a timely basis. Include this process in the PMP.	December 2018	3	3	Medium	Med	Open	1/31/2019 - Both the ASI and DHS proposed deliverable review and approval processes in January. The DHS PMO and BES Project Manager drafted a deliverable review/approval process that includes the PMO preferred Deliverable Comment Form (DCF) to aggregate reviewer comments. The ASI included a deliverable review/approval process along with an alternate comment form within the draft PMP. The DHS PMO is working with the ASI to determine the process to be implemented and, when agreed upon, roll-out to the Project Team. 12/31/2018 - IVV provided a sample of a deliverable management process on 12/20/18 to the DHS Project Manager that could be modified for the BES Project. The DHS PM and the PMO are developing a review and approval process and are in discussions with the ASI to mitigate the risk. Until a process is developed, finalized, and executed, DHS, the ASI and IV&V will use email notifications to ensure new and/or updated deliverables will be reviewed timely. Additionally, the ASI and IV&V developed MS-Excel spreadsheets to track status.				
5	The Project Partnership Understanding (PPU) for the BES Project has not been approved by CMS, which may impact the project schedule and funding.	Finding - Risk	11/26/2018		Project Manager	Observation	The CMS Project Partnership Understanding (PPU) is not finalized between the State and CMS for this project. If funding is expected from CMS, they may require alignment to the MITA Framework, Gate Reviews and/or use of the Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Toolkit (MEET) Checklists. The MEET checklists are developed prior to the CMS gate reviews and are part of the Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Life Cycle (MEELC) that defines the CMS processes for Eligibility and Enrollment projects.	If the PPU is not finalized prior to the State's approval of the functional and technical requirements, the projects Federal funding may be at risk.	The State and CMS complete the PPU and the project incorporate all Federal reporting and process requirements into the appropriate project deliverables.	Prior to Functional	5	3	High	High	Open	1/31/2019 - No update. 12/31/2018 - On December 17, 2018, the State submitted the PPU to CMS for their review and approval. The PPU limits scope to any new Medicaid Functionality and includes the CMS Status Report Schedule and overall BES high-level schedule.				

No.	Title	Finding Type	Identified Date	Date Retired	Category	Source	Observation	Significance	Recommendation	Event Horizon	Impact	Probability	Priority	Analyst	Prk Finding	Stat	Status Update	Client Comments	Vendor Comments	Project Risk Sta	Project Risk Ow
6	The BES Risk and Issues Log lacks necessary data elements, which are needed to afford complete transparency.	Finding - Risk	11/26/2018		Project Manager	Observation	IV&V has observed that the current Risk and Issues log on SharePoint lacks certain necessary data elements to effectively mitigate risks and contain issues. These elements include Risk Exposure, Required Mitigation / Closure Timeframe or Date, Mitigation Steps, and Updates to Mitigation Steps. It should be noted that the current Risk and Issues Log was provided by DHS and is in the default DHS Risk and Issues format.	Complete documentation of risk and issues is critical to mitigate risks on current projects and prevent similar issues on future projects. Without the integration of effective risk and issue tracking with project status reporting, complete transparency is not afforded and the ability to mitigate risk is diminished.	Meet (DHS, ASI, IV&V) to determine all elements needed to support the Risk and Issue Management processes. Following that activity, update the Risk and Issues log to reflect all agreed-upon elements.	February 2019	4	2	Medium	Med	Open		01/31/2019 - Late in the month (1/29), the Project decided to abandon the SharePoint log in favor of an Excel workbook developed by the ASI. IVV will review and assess the new workbook in early February to determine if all needed elements for risk and issue tracking have been included. 12/31/18: The planned meeting to review, discuss, and tailor the Risk and Issues Log was not held in December, but is anticipated to be held in early January. 12/06/2018: IVV recognizes that the SharePoint Log was provided by DHS. A meeting to review, discuss, and tailor the log to meet the needs of the BES Project is expected to take place during December.	12/4/18, Tracey Laride: Key Finding #6, p.12. Is the "Risk Exposure" the same as the Severity or Probability fields on SharePoint? If not, then can you clarify what "Risk Exposure" is? I think "Mitigation Steps" may be the same as Recommendation(s) in the log? If yes, the title can be changed to Mitigation Steps. For the "Updates to Mitigation Steps", it is entered with a date of the update into the comments section of the logged item. If needed, the field title can be changed.	12/6/18, Keith Stock, Unisys:6) The risk and issue log has been provided as a default to all DHS projects along with instructions. DHS PMO has asked for clarification from IV and V and will likely agree to add additional fields		
7	The Change Management Process is not fully documented and approved, which could delay Change Requests and affect scope, schedule, cost, and quality.	Finding - Risk	11/27/2018		Project Manager	Observation	The Change Management Process is not yet documented and approved. All three (3) risks currently tracked in the SharePoint Risk and Issues log indicate the potential need for a formalized Change Management process.	If the Change Management process is not developed and instituted, there is a high likelihood that needed Change Requests could be delayed, which could negatively affect scope, schedule, cost, and quality.	IVV recommends that the ASI complete development of the Change Management Plan, and collaborate with DHS to ensure the process is institutionalized for the BES Project.	January 2019	3	3	Medium	Med	Open		01/29/19 - The ASI updated the Change Management Plan sub component of the PMP, and delivered it as a draft. IV&V is in process of review and assessment of all PMP sub plans. 12/31/18: IV&V reviewed the Change Management Plan artifact, and provided assessment comments to DHS and the ASI for resolution. The risk remains open at a Medium criticality pending finalization of the Plan. 12/6/18: IV&V was provided a copy of the Change Management artifact in early December. IV&V will review the document during December and update this finding accordingly.	12/4/18, Tracey Laride: Key Finding #7, p.12. The Change Management process is documented and is in the review process with DHS.			
8	The SharePoint Decision Log is not being used to record project decisions, which will hamper communications and cause decisions to be revisited	Finding - Risk	11/27/2018	12/6/2018	Project Manager	Observation	The SharePoint Decisions Log is not being used to record and track project decisions, and it requires additional data elements for tracking and reporting on Decisions such as: Decision Types, Decision Sub-Categories, etc.	If Project Decisions are not recorded on a central repository (such as the SharePoint Log developed for this purpose), communications based on Project Decisions are likely to become hampered, and decisions will need to be revisited multiple times.	IV&V recommends that DHS, the ASI, and IV&V meet to determine all elements needed to support the Decision Log and associated processes, and that the project institutionalizes the process. Following that activity, IV&V recommends that the DHS SharePoint Decisions log is updated to reflect all agreed-to needed elements and decisions.	January 2019	3	3	Medium	Med	Retired		12/06/2018: Per the ASI, there are no Decisions to enter into the Decisions Log. This is confirmed with DHS BES. Based on this correction of fact, IV&V will retire this finding, and will open up new findings to address the separate topics of the lack of a documented decision making process and the need for additional data elements in the Decision Log.	12/4/18, Tracey Laride: Key Finding #8, p. 13. Is the IV&V recommending DD&I BESSD decisions (requirements, design, etc.) be logged here or BES Scope (Change Management) decisions be logged here or both?	12/6/18, Keith Stock, Unisys: 8). It is being used there just are not any decisions yet to log		
9	BESSD leads and/or teams have not been assigned to the Project, which negatively impact the schedule and workload.	Finding - Risk	11/30/2018		Project Manager	Observation	IV&V has observed that DHS has not designated specific individuals to serve as BESSD leads to support the project. In addition, although the SharePoint site for the project indicates that BESSD teams have been envisaged for BI and Reporting, Data Conversion, Functional, Organizational Change Management, Project Management, Security, Technical, Testing and Training, team members have not been identified.	Without committing dedicated BESSD resources to the project, the schedule is at risk as project demands (e.g., meeting attendance, document review) and workloads increase. For a project of this size and significance, the involvement of subject matter experts to ensure that the solution is designed to meet the business needs is critical.	*Identify high-priority areas where BESSD Leads are needed and obtain executive level support to reallocate BESSD staff to the project soon as possible. Re-assess the need for support throughout the project life cycle to ensure that the appropriate subject matter experts are available as required.	January 2019	5	3	High	Med	Open		The DHS Project Manager (PM) provided Unisys with the staffing assignments for deliverable reviews on 12/31/18. Further, the DHS PM advised IV&V that DHS BESSD has defined roles and assigned Lead responsibilities for IADs to their project staff, and an escalation process has been defined. This information was announced the week of December 31st. This risk remains open – downgraded to a Medium criticality – pending observation of results of these actions.				
10	The number of instances of Siebel to be implemented for BES Project is undecided, which may impact the project schedule and project costs.	Finding - Risk	11/28/2018		Configuration	an Observation	Discussions are ongoing regarding the need for single vs. dual instances of Siebel to support the ability to share data between MOD and BESSD. Although the ASI's BAFO proposed dual instances and the ASI has indicated the need to memorialize this in the project Decision Log, DHS has expressed an interest in a single instance. This scope change could introduce a significant cost/schedule impact to the project. The ASI is currently tracking this as a high risk to the project and has indicated this could incur a 1 year delay. Details of moving to a single instance have yet to be resolved. Such a move would be out of scope of the existing contract. The decision on one versus two instances of Siebel could have negative impact to scope, cost and schedule.	This scope change could introduce a significant cost/schedule impact to the project. A decision to move forward with one versus two Siebel instances could result in additional project costs and schedule delay, and would likely be a significant effort that is out of scope of the existing contract. If the decision is delayed, the vision of data sharing between the departments could be compromised. The sooner this decision is finalized, the better the chances for successful mitigation in the best interest of the project.	1. Work collaboratively (DHS, ASI and ESI) to develop a long term infrastructure strategy along with 5+ year ROI, cost/benefit, license strategy, and risk proposition that includes an assessment of a single vs. dual instance assessment. 2. Record the decision in the Decision Log – even if the decision remains within project scope – to memorialize the outcome and alleviate the impact of the topic resurfacing later.	Q1 2019	4	4	High	High	Open		1/31/18 - ASI has provided DHS with Use cases which DHS has reviewed. DHS to determine if a CR will be submitted to develop ROM pricing and schedule impacts for a single instance. 12/31/18: DHS PMO is developing use cases that will describe the DHS business need (i.e., the overarching need for all of DHS vs only BESSD), and intends to discuss the business need for a single instance with Unisys in January to help bring about an understanding of the importance and urgency. This risk remains high due to increasingly high potential for rework the longer a decision is pending. 12/6/18: The language about a CR caused the finding to be a bit misleading and we have removed the language. Our intent was simply to state that we cannot yet fully analyze the impact. Nevertheless the finding remains open.	12/6/18, Keith Stock, Unisys:10) We agree that this "decision" needs to be finalized and memorialized. However, we are unclear as to how a potential change request (i.e. potentially changing from the proposed dual instance approach to a single instance) is a high risk to the project. It would be a change. If a change is requested, the change would go through the Change Request process where DHS could assess the impact of cost, time, etc. and determine to move forward or not. In other words, if we do nothing, no issue, we are moving forward as proposed no risk. If they decide to change, they will do so via the CR process with all available information and schedules and costs would be adjusted accordingly.			
11	Changes in direction regarding the preferred business intelligence (BI)/reporting tool may impact project schedule and cost. [Cognos vs. OBIEE]	Finding - Risk	11/28/2018		Configuration	an Observation	The project intends to utilize OBIEE, instead of Cognos, for the BES project business intelligence (BI)/reporting solution. The Change Request (CR) for this change to the original contract has been drafted and is currently under review. Unclear if DHS will be able to fund this CR or if it will involve de-scoping/scope swaps.	IV&V has insufficient information to fully analyze the impact(s) on this project, thus a low criticality rating has been assigned until such analysis can be performed.	* Complete the CR process to obtain a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) estimate and/or impact analysis as appropriate	Q1 2019	3	4	High	Low	Open		1/31/19 - No progress. 12/31/18: A draft CR was initiated by DHS but has not yet been provided to Unisys to start the change management process. The draft CR contains no stated impacts to the schedule, project cost, or platform costs (e.g., licensing, et al). This low criticality risk remains open pending completion of the CR process.				
12	Changes in direction regarding the preferred platform for portal development may impact project schedule and cost. [LifeRay vs. Adobe]	Finding - Risk	11/28/2018		Configuration	an Observation	The project intends to utilize Adobe as the preferred platform for portal development, instead of LifeRay (which is currently used for the existing KOLEA portal platform), as the BES project web portal solution. Adobe Forms is currently out of scope for the BES portal but is in scope for BES PDF production. This decision represents a change in scope and requires a CR, which is currently in process. As of the date of this report, the Project is tracking this as a 'Top Level Issue.' It is unclear if DHS will be able to fund this CR or if it will involve de-scoping/scope swaps.	If DHS executes a change request to implement Adobe as the BES portal solution, there will be a significant impact to the project budget. ASI has given DHS a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) estimate of \$2.8 million for this CR. The ASI has stated that if the portal platform is not decided soon there will be schedule impacts as they need to staff for the appropriate skillset. ASI has also stated they may begin developing a solution in LifeRay until a CR is executed to move to Adobe.	* DHS request more details from the ASI to better understand the details around such a high cost to move to an Adobe-based BES portal solution. * DHS request more details from the ASI to better understand the ASI's urgency to begin portal development now instead of focusing on other areas of design and development.	Q1 2019	3	3	Medium	Low	Open		1/31/19 - A project impact assessment (PIA) is being created by the ASI. The ASI previously estimated the overall ROM cost to be approximately \$2.8M. ASI has estimated annual license costs for LifeRay to be \$80k/yr and Adobe at \$140k/yr. 12/29/18: A CR was initiated by DHS and provided to Unisys in December. An Initial Business Review (IBR) of the CR was originally scheduled for 12/28/18 but subsequently moved to early January. The IBR confirms the CR goals. The only impact identified to date is an increase in licensing costs. The CR has not been evaluated for impacts to ASI vendor costs or project schedule changes. However, Adobe is the department's standard for websites. This low criticality risk remains open pending completion of the CR process.				
13	Differing ASI and ESI expectations regarding DDI environments may impact project schedule and cost	Finding - Risk	11/28/2018		Configuration	an Observation	The ASI has requested development environments to support BES DDI that the existing on-premise infrastructure may not support. There is discussion that the underlying challenge relates solely to the number of environments, in fact, the ASI is not requesting more environments than specified in their BAFO. The ASI is requesting development environments for the BES Project that are aligned with the platform and application software upon which the BES solution will reside in production. A potential solution, or by-product, of this request is to add environments to accommodate the platform and application software – resulting in a net increase in environments within the existing infrastructure. It is important to note that this risk focuses on the need for suitable (i.e., fit for purpose) DDI environments rather than a certain number of environments. It is IV&V understanding that the existing KOLEA development environments have not been kept up to date (e.g., tool and operating system patches and updates) and that a concerted effort to bring those environments current would be necessary if the ASI could use the KOLEA environments at all. However, since the BES solution is planned to be implemented on a higher version (version 17) of Siebel than KOLEA uses (version 15), the ASI cannot use existing KOLEA environments even if those environments were up to date for their platform version(s). The Project requires development environments that align with the future production environment and platform. The cost impact of acquiring these suitable development environments could be substantial. The Project is tracking this and has rated the ESI and Platform Items as Yellow in the most current status report; nevertheless, IV&V considers this risk to be Red due to the level of complexity and potential cost and schedule impacts.	If the ASI is constrained by having to develop the BES solution in the existing KOLEA development environments (regardless whether those environments are up to date), the quality of the BES solution may be negatively affected. The BES solution could not be fully tested on a production-like platform prior to roll-out or go-live. Nuances between Siebel versions, among other supporting software versions, between development and production can cause unexpected defects ranging from catastrophic to annoying. Creating suitable development environments for BES is a task that, from all appearances, was not anticipated by the ESI or DHS. Contract details notwithstanding, creation of new or re-purposed environments is complex and will require time and effort from DHS, the ESI, and the ASI. The contract details, particularly around the responsibility for the cost of creating BES development environments, and potential increased licensing fees may ultimately result in increased costs to DHS. Both of these impacts may subsequently cause delay to the BES project schedule.	* ASI work with the State to reach a common understanding of the requirements for the BES DDI environments. * ESI and ASI work together to formulate an environment strategy that will meet the project platform and development needs and minimize impact to the State.	Q1 2019	4	4	High	High	Open		1/31/19 - This risk was also logged by the Project on 12/5. The Project has since escalated the risk to an issue. The ASI stated on 1/30 that it needs the DEV2 and Unisys have indicated a need for more environments than expected and we have a disagreement about exactly what the contracts require or allow. We had a big meeting at Unisys to discuss the problem and BIAS and Unisys have submitted preliminary solutions. Both solutions involve setting up BES environments on the cloud and they require additional funding. I plan to meet with both next week and I have a meeting with Oracle on Thursday to discuss price of cloud capacity. We recently signed the year 2 extension for BIAS and there is a priced option for them to build the environments. I would also note that Unisys has a deliverable for their environments plan that we have not received yet, so I believe requests for environments without an approved plan is premature. [See also client comments.] 12/6/18: Finding clarified to focus on the suitability of the environments rather than the 'number'	2/6/19, Bill Thornton, Unisys: Findings and Recommendations (#13) – Configuration and Development DEV environment – This issue was entered into the risk register on December 5th not 1/30 as implied in this risk write-up. 12/6/18, Keith Stock, Unisys: 13) The comment that the ASI vendor is requesting "additional environments" is misleading. The ASI vendor is requesting the number of environments as described in our proposal and subsequent contract. The recommendation that the ESI and ASI vendors work together to come up with an environment strategy that "will not incur additional cost to the State" may not be possible – recommend the recommendation be that a strategy be identified that minimizes additional cost to the State.	Medium		

No.	Title	Finding Type	Identified Date	Date Retired	Category	Source	Observation	Significance	Recommendation	Event Horizon	Impact	Probability	Priority	Analyst Pric Finding Sta	Status Update	Client Comments	Vendor Comments	Project Risk Sta	Project Risk Ow	
14	The Decision Log process is undefined, which may hamper communication and discovery of Project Decisions.	Finding - Risk	11/27/2018		Project Manager Observation	Project Manager Observation	The process by which key project decisions should be added to the Decision Log is undefined and unclear. While it is not realistic to add each and every detailed project decision to a Decision Log, parameters need to be determined and documented that clearly indicate which decisions should be added to the log versus which decisions should not be added to the log.	If guidance is undefined/unclear on how the Decision Log will be utilized, it is highly likely that the log's purpose will not be met. Decisions at a too-detailed level will 'clutter' the log, and decisions at a too-broad level will cause decisions to be remain undiscovered; both of which will cause team members to be unaware of such decisions. The impact of both may cause rework in the project, which could lead to project delays and diminish project quality.	IV&V recommends that DHS, the ASI, and IV&V meet to determine the parameters that will be used to identify the level and types of decisions that will be entered in the log. This information should then be recorded in the Project Management Plan, Communications Plan, or other appropriate document/artifact.	First Key Decision	4	3	High	Low	Open	01/29/19: No change. Review of the draft PMP is underway, however the Decision Log process was not found in the initial review of the PMP. 12/31/18: No change. Parameters for how the Decision Log will be utilized have not yet been documented by the ASI or DHS PMO. It is assumed that this may be documented in the Project Management Plan, which has not yet been delivered to DHS. 12/6/18: Rated Low by the analyst due to only one Decision in play at this point in time.				
15	The Decision Log lacks data elements needed for tracking and reporting on key Project Decisions, which may hamper discovery of decisions.	Finding - Risk	11/27/2018		Project Manager Observation	Project Manager Observation	The SharePoint Decision Log requires additional data elements for tracking and reporting on Decisions such as: Decision Types, Decision Sub-Categories, etc.	If material data about the decision is not tracked and recorded, the Project may miss opportunities to benefit from trends in key decisions. Additionally, inadequate data capture may hamper reporting on decisions and ultimately obscure discovery of key decisions by project team members.	DHS, the ASI, and IV&V meet to determine all elements needed to support the Decision Log and associated processes. Following that activity, IV&V recommends that the DHS SharePoint Decisions log is updated to reflect all agreed-to needed elements and decisions.	First Key Decision	3	3	Medium	Low	Open	01/29/19: No change. Review of the draft PMP is underway, however Decision Log elements were not found in the initial review of the PMP. 12/31/18: No change. The necessary data elements for the Decision Log have not yet been finalized by the ASI or PMO. It is assumed that this may be documented in the Project Management Plan, which has not yet been delivered to DHS. 12/6/18: Rated Low by the analyst due to only one Decision in play at this point in time.				
16	Lack of clear understanding of SI DDI approach may reduce effectiveness of JARS and JADs	Finding - Risk	12/17/2018		Configuration an Observation;#Customer Concern	Configuration an Observation;#Customer Concern	Several DHS stakeholders have commented that the SI Design, Development, and Implementation (DDI) approach is unclear. While stakeholders can observe SI activity and have participated in some SI activities, they do not understand how it all fits together and some activity objectives seem unclear. The SI conducted a DDI approach overview session during an initial JAR session, however not all stakeholders were present. IV&V did not locate any DDI approach documentation or materials that could be referenced by stakeholders who may have missed to the overview session, by new members of the team, or by other interested parties.	Lack of stakeholder understanding and buy-in to the SI DDI approach and project activity objectives may reduce the effectiveness of JAR and JAD sessions as well as other BES project activities and decisions.	PCG recommends one or more of the following to mitigate this risk: • SI provide an additional DDI approach overview session for stakeholders and allow for Q&A • SI provide DDI approach documentation/materials for stakeholders to review and/or refresh their knowledge on demand; the materials could be made available via the project SharePoint • SI and DHS accelerate review, resubmission and approval of an acceptable DDI Plan DED to facilitate submission of DDI Plan deliverable • SI submit DDI Plan deliverable and make it easily available to all project stakeholders	1/31/19	4	3	High	Med	Open	1/31/19: There remains some confusion over what the ASI has agreed to do to increase understanding of the overall ASI DDI approach for DHS leadership and JAD participants. The ASI produced a DDI Plan (BI-06) DED and received feedback/comments. Their response to the deliverable comment form (DCF) comments has not yet been provided to DHS. The ASI has begun execution of a process improvement plan (PIP) that includes providing some DDI approach information in JAD packets sent to JAD participants prior to JAD sessions. DHS leadership continues to state that they remain unclear on the SI's DDI approach. 12/31/18: The SI has agreed to provide approach documentation and separate sessions, however, IV&V has not seen any progress towards this to date.	1/7/19: Note. During the 01-02-18 [sic] status meeting, DHS did not decline the offer and made suggestions. To my understanding, Unisys offered to present the orientation during each JAD session. It was suggested by DHS that the pre-JAD packet be placed in the SharePoint project site. For new participants in the JADs, a separate orientation before the JAD should be held for those new participants.	1/3/19 - Unisys (Bill Thornton) reports that they offered to provide the approach materials in the pre-JAD package and conduct an overview prior to each JAD session, however, DHS has declined this offer.		
17	The Project may experience the situation where several deliverables may be presented to DHS for review and approval within a short period of time, which may cause schedule delays.	Finding - Risk	1/16/2019		Project Manager Observation	Project Manager Observation	The lack of a deliverable review process, delays occurring in the DED review and approval process and final approved DED's may result in the ASI to submitting multiple deliverables for review/approval at the same time or within a short time frame. Following the early identification of this risk, DHS, ASI and IV&V met to gain a better understanding of revised deliverable schedule. The ASI has not published an updated schedule (as of the end of January), therefore it is unknown at this point when the project deliverables will be available for review.	An unusually high number of deliverables submitted for review in the same general time frame may be more than available State staff are able to process in desired review cycle times. This will in turn cause new delays in approvals of the submitted deliverables; increasing the risk for negative project schedule impact.	Options to mitigate the risk include: • Prioritizing the deliverables to identify those that should be reviewed first based on the criteria of schedule impact and/or cross-deliverable integration; • Review of interim drafts; • Addition of DHS resources to review/approve deliverables; • Addition of DHS review time for the larger deliverables; and/or • Adopt an option of 'conditional' approval with specific criteria that must be met to achieve final approval.	Unknown at this tir	4	5	High	Med	Open	01/31/2019 - The ASI has not published the revised schedule yet. We will continue to monitor this risk.			Jolene	