State of North Dakota

The Delivery of ConnectND

Post Implementation Review
For State Government

October 1, 2006

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ... 3

PURPOSE: ... 3
EVALUATION OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES ... 3
KEY PROJECT METRICS ... 4
LESSONS LEARNED: ... 6

DETAILED ANALYSIS: ... 7

EVALUATION OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES ... 7
RETURN ON INVESTMENT: ... 8
1. Reduce or Eliminate "Shadow Systems": ... 8
2. Statewide Integration on a Common System: ... 9
3. Establish a Self-Service Environment for Vendors: ... 11
4. Establish a Self-Service Environment for Employees: ... 12
5. Integrated Workflow, Industry Best Practices and Reduced Dependence on Paper: ... 13
6. Platform for Re-engineering Business Practices and Continued Process Improvements: ... 13
7. Cross Trained Workforce: ... 15
Other Benefits: ... 16
KEY PROJECT METRICS ... 16
Cost ... 16
Schedule ... 17
Scope ... 17
Quality ... 18
Lessons Learned: ... 20
Closing: ... 21

SURVEY RESULTS ... 21

A. PRODUCT EFFECTIVENESS ... 21
B. CSSQ MANAGEMENT ... 22
C. RISK MANAGEMENT ... 24
D. COMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT ... 24
E. ACCEPTANCE MANAGEMENT ... 26
F. ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT ... 26
G. ISSUES MANAGEMENT ... 27
H. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND TRANSITION ... 28
I. PERFORMANCE OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION ... 29
J. PERFORMANCE OF PROJECT TEAM ... 30
K. OTHER LESSONS AND COMMENTS ... 32

Post-Implementation Report

Executive Summary:

Purpose:

In April 2002 the state of North Dakota began a significant and unique undertaking, to implement a financial system combining state government and higher education. To make sure the effort was not too easy the state added human resources and student administration applications to the project. This effort became known as ConnectND. When completed, North Dakota would become the first state to successfully accomplish this.

Over the past three years, there have been many ups-and-downs and lessons learned. This document will examine those lessons learned to give future projects a roadmap of things to do and not to do. In addition, it will report on the benefits of ConnectND based upon the Return on Investment document dated October 1, 2004.

The state of North Dakota has much to be proud of with the implementation of ConnectND. This is not to say there are no problems or challenges that we have yet to overcome, but we can be proud to show the world the level of cooperation and teamwork that it took to accomplish what we have. Over the years as we continue to grow with this new tool, we anticipate the state receiving continuing value by this endeavor.

Evaluation of Project Objectives

A return on investment (ROI) document was originally released on January 3, 2003 to document the cost of moving to a new system and the benefits or reasons that a new system would provide value. It was updated in March of 2004 and again in October of 2004. The following assessment was based upon the October 2004 final document. The ROI examined both direct and indirect benefits.

There were eight key benefits identified in the Return on Investment document. It was never intended that hard dollar costs of these benefits would be tracked. Even measuring the benefits by other means has been difficult; however some metrics and examples have been gathered to demonstrate the value of the project. Following are some of the highlights, more information can be found in the detailed analysis.

1. Reduce or Eliminate "Shadow Systems"
   - Several major systems were replaced including SAMIS (financials), ISI (payroll), FARIS (DOT financials), Great Plains Accounting at NDPERS, and BND Payroll.
   - The Time and Labor module was taken out of scope and agencies requiring this functionality are still running their systems. An effort has been underway for some time to identify a solution.
   - Reporting and data access continue to be issues. Additional steps are outlined in the ConnectND Strategic Plan.
2. Statewide Integration on a Common System
   - Real time interfaces exist between Financials and HR.
   - The portal provides single sign-on access to all modules.
   - CAFR reporting is streamlined. Time spent on research for reconciliation has been cut in half.
   - The ISI system handled payroll only. PeopleSoft incorporates additional human resource management functionality.
   - The State and NDUS share the top three levels of the account codes making possible to develop combined reports.
   - A single database for employee data means that if an employee transfers from one agency to another, data does not have to be reentered.
   - The integration of Asset Management with Financials means that year-end reporting is streamlined and can be done in days rather than weeks.
3. Establish a Self-Service Environment for Vendors

- This module was eliminated from the project due to lack of resources.
- Capability was incorporated to give vendors a single point of contact through Vendor Inquiry.
- The state now issues one 1099 to each vendor where previously each agency issued them separately.

4. Establish a Self-Service Environment for Employees
   - Employees have access to paycheck advices, benefit information, and leave balances online.
   - The basis exists for rolling out future functionality like Open Enrollment, Absence Management, and Candidate Gateway.
5. Improved Self-Service Environment for Students & Faculty – This was an NDUS only benefit.
6. Integrated Workflow, Industry Best Practices and Reduced Dependence on Paper
   - Printing and delivery of payroll advices has dropped from 8,530 to 822 as of July 2006 as employee self-service was implemented.
   - An online process for processing abstracts has eliminated paper.
   - Four part purchase order printing has been eliminated and agencies have the option of emailing, faxing or printing orders.
7. Platform for Re-engineering Business Practices and Continued Process Improvements
   - Payment approvals are done online - allowing next day payment rather than a wait or two days or more.
   - The State and NDUS share the same purchasing card provider who receives one payment per month rather than one from each agency.
   - Application support and system interfaces require less technical staff involvement.
   - Additional process improvements are expected as users become familiar with the system.
8. Cross Trained Workforce
   - Over 1400 state employees have been trained in some aspect of PeopleSoft. Employees to move to a different agency do not require retraining.
   - User groups have been established to share knowledge.
   - The State and Higher Ed have shared development staff to handle backlogs.
9. Other
   - The web-based architecture means that employees can work from anywhere that has an internet connection, whether home or traveling for business.
   - Because PeopleSoft is a major player in the ERP market, many 3rd party applications have pre-built interfaces to PeopleSoft making it easier to extend the capabilities.

Key Project Metrics

Cost

This project was actually a cooperative project between state government and Higher Ed. The total project cost came in at $49,220,000 with Higher Educations portion approximately $31.6 million. Below is a breakout of the state government's costs.

The state government portion of the project came in about 21% over budget as detailed in the chart below.

Post-Implementation Report

	Budget	Cost	Difference
PeopleSoft Software	2,279,738.82	2,282,103.00	2,364.18
Implementation	9,806,014.65	9,806,014.65	0
Amendments		948,705.41	948,705.41
Equipment/Hosting	756,850.00	616,339.00	(140,511.00)
Staffing/Training	1,732,407.00	3,956,901.18	2,224,494.18
Totals	14,575,010.47	17,610,063.24	3,035,052.77
% Difference			21%

There were two areas that make up the bulk of that overrun. The first area is amendments, which accounts for almost $1 million of the total $3 million overrun. There were three (3) amendments approved that composed most of the budget changes.

The other area of overruns was Staffing/Training, accounting for $2.2 million of the overrun. This is primarily additional ITD staff time applied to the project. These were staff that was reallocated from other projects. The initial budget did not recognize this as a project cost. Changes in project accounting were implemented during the project to reflect best practices.

The ROI document also estimated that the new system would cost $2.9 million per year to operate. ITD and OMB established rates to cover those costs on an ongoing basis. Actual costs have been approximately $2.7 million for the State.

Schedule

All schedule changes were based on the amendments noted in the cost section.

	Start Date	Scheduled End Date	Actual End Date	Difference	% Variance
Original Schedule	April 2002	June 2004	Sept 2004	3 months	12%

The dates above are implementation dates with an anticipated post implementation support planned through 3rd quarter of 2004. Actual support was adjusted via the amendments to limit the cost impact. Support was only a little over a month long with partial support supplied as needed in the following month.

Scope

Implementation of the PeopleSoft Financials suite (FIN) originally included: Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, Asset Management, Billing, Budget Planning, e-Procurement, General Ledger, Inventory, Projects, Grants Management and Purchasing modules. During the project, state government determined not to implement the e-Procurement and Grants Management modules. The expense module was added to the scope of implementation and deployed to pilot agencies. The EPM budget module was piloted but determined not to be deployed as part of the implementation.

Implementation of the PeopleSoft HRMS suite (HRMS) originally included: Human Resources, Benefit Administration, Flexible Spending Administration, Payroll, and Time and Labor modules. Time & Labor was not rolled out due to the decision not to commit to a change in payroll schedule and incorporating a lag in payment. Other than that, all of the planned scope was completed. Recruit work force and training module were added to the scope of implementation. The Government Portal was completed with a staggered rollout to the general employee population as e-Applications were implemented.

During the implementation, a Version control product called STAT was added to the scope of implementation to provide a standardized and automated means for approving system changes and migrating them to production.

Post-Implementation Report

Quality

In general, the project lacked a consistent set of quality measurements. However, quality should be examined in several ways.

- Project Quality relates to how well we did in following good project management practices. From an overall standpoint, very little emphasis was placed on measuring quality of project processes. There were project plans and schedules, but they were seldom maintained appropriately. At one point three different issue logs were being used simultaneously.
- Technological Quality is another factor that needs to be examined. From a technical standpoint, the state technical team did place a large degree of effort on quality control regarding data conversions, unit testing and system integration. But they also had gaps in that area. For example, the QA testing was conducted but no authoritative controls were in place to freeze code changes between Higher Ed. and State during the staggered go live dates.
- Product Quality should be the end result of the above two quality items, but it also covers areas that could be missed above. For example measuring the number of problem paychecks in the payroll rollout. Some of the key quality metrics are found below:
    - The state's first payroll cycle on PeopleSoft went very well. Between the advanced and supplemental payrolls the state processed a total of 10,210 checks and advices. There were only a total of 38 manual checks and 18 reversals.
    - People were surprised that the apparent speed of the web based system is not as fast as the mainframe system. Because this was not addressed in quality and organizational change management, end users were unprepared for the change and were unhappy with the performance right after the rollout. Since then, updates and patches have been applied that have improved the performance, but it still does not match the apparent speed of the mainframe system.
    - The preparation of the CAFR (Comprehensive Annual Financial Report) is an example of both pluses and minuses. First, the reporting process has become more efficient. Moving from the mainframe system to PeopleSoft allowed for real-time updating of data and the elimination of cumbersome mainframe batch jobs. Additionally, the creation of data downloads has moved from ITD programmers to OMB accountants, which allows for more timely and in-depth analysis of data. The PeopleSoft system also allows much greater flexibility in the report presentation and rollup, and reports can be run directly into Excel whereas the old system required re-keying data into Excel spreadsheets. On the negative side, the system configuration for accounting entries does not accurately report year-end accruals so many more entries and additional time is required to get certain payable and receivable accounts properly reported.

The lack of people, schedule and budget all played a role in the limited role of quality in the project. This area should be much better defined in future projects.

Lessons Learned:

There were many lessons learned in this project. Below are a few of the key highlights.

- We have celebrated that North Dakota completed this project with less resources, less money, and less time than anyone else. It is something we can be proud of. There is a price paid for that however. That price was to staff and some of the pain points we have suffered since the rollout.
- One of the top lessons learned is that project management is critical to the success of the project. This role cannot just be assigned to the knowledge expert. Project

management is designed to help compensate and overcome many of the issues that this project faced.

- A vendor should not be hired for overall project management for a project that they are also the primary contractor. Project Management can and should be a component of the deliverables by the vendor, but a state or other 3rd party person should be responsible for the overall project.
- An executive from the vendor should be a member of the Executive Steering Committee (ESC). There are actually 2 lessons in this statement. First, the vendor is a part of the ESC. Second, the appropriate member to attend is not the Project Manager or senior member of the team on location, (unless needed for a particular issue) but is an executive who has the authority to make the deals necessary at this level.
- ESC meetings should be held on a regular basis. Monthly would be a good baseline to start with. It is easier to cancel meetings like this than schedule them. However, even if the news is all good, there is value to be had by just having the senior management of all the important stakeholders talk with each other.
- In future projects, we need better controls in the contract regarding Risk & Quality. At the time we began this project, our relative maturity in these key project management processes was fairly low. We needed to do a better job of identifying and managing risk. We also need to ensure the controls are in place to have better control of the quality of the project.
- Along the same lines, we needed to do better at organizational change management. The project did a fairly good job of managing the organizational changes within OMB and ITD. However, it did not do a very good job of managing organizational changes within the agencies. As mentioned in several places above, the next project should examine the methodology used to implement or come up with better way to engage users so there are no surprises during end-user training.
- Do not underestimate the power of a report –It is clear that more time should have been spent on designing reports. Reports & queries remain a primary sore spot for agencies. The project ran into a security issue that forced it to change expectations on what could be delivered to the agencies. This wasn't discovered until late into the project. By then it was also too late to do any major adjustments for additional reports. More details on this can be found in the Lessons Learned section of the Detailed Analysis.

Detailed Analysis:

Evaluation of Project Objectives

A return on investment (ROI) document was originally released on January 3, 2003. It was updated in March of 2004 and again in October of 2004. The following assessment was based upon the October 2004 final document. The ROI examined both direct and indirect benefits.

There were eight key points identified in the Return on Investment document.

- (Reduce or Eliminate "Shadow Systems"
- Statewide Integration on a Common System
- Establish a Self-Service Environment for Vendors
- Establish a Self-Service Environment for Employees
- Improved Self-Service Environment for Students & Faculty
- Integrated Workflow, Industry Best Practices and Reduced Dependence on Paper
- Platform for Re-engineering Business Practices and Continued Process Improvements
- Cross Trained Workforce

The fifth bullet point above relates solely to Higher Education and will not be addressed in this document.

What we have found in the detailed analysis was that it was very difficult to actually measure many of the items listed. However, we were able to find and demonstrate many positive benefits in these categories and feel the project has met its intended goal.

Return on Investment:

1. **Reduce or Eliminate "Shadow Systems":** The estimated 10-year benefit was set at $7,832,936. We have found it extremely difficult to calculate hard dollar benefits, but we do believe this goal is being achieved.

   State Government was able to eliminate several major systems – SAMIS, ISI, FARIS, Great Plains, HR system, & SPO. There were a number of exceptions granted mostly relating to the fact that Time and Labor still needs to be implemented.

   The PeopleSoft HR/Fin applications have directly replaced the State's SAMIS, FARIS and ISI (Payroll) systems. The SAMIS (Accounting) system was a mainframe accounting system used by State agencies. The FARIS (Accounting) system was a copy of SAMIS and used exclusively by the Department of Transportation. A significant benefit of the PeopleSoft implementation included deploying a single instance of the Financial and HRMS applications eliminating the need for a maintaining two sets of code.

   In replacing the SAMIS system this also included replacing subsystems with one integrated solution. Examples include; Central Services Inventory system, State's Surplus Property and CAFR reporting system. Each of these systems existed on the mainframe and involved additional programs and databases. In all, the SAMIS system was the largest source of replicated data. The SAMIS system encompassed, at a minimum, 900 programs and hundreds of files and batch jobs that were directly replaced by the PeopleSoft Financial module.

   The ISI (Payroll) system also contained approx. 300+ programs and the online portion was difficult to maintain due to the complexity of code. The ISI system did not include Human Resource management information. A number of agencies utilized excel documents, access data bases and other means of storing Human Resource information. The PeopleSoft implementation included HRMS functionality. The basic components were implemented within the ConnectND project and a large volume of licensed functionality is anticipated to be deployed

   An additional example where multiple systems large and small existed involved Assets. The CD1 mainframe application was used for maintaining and tracking assets for some agencies. Many agencies had all their assets on here not just those over $5,000. Additionally, a number of excel, access and other small systems were maintained by agencies. Although some shadow systems remain, the base line infrastructure was built to expand the use of the Asset module.

   Other Eliminated Systems:

   - Bank of ND payroll system
   - Great Plains accounting packages:
     - NDPERS (completed), Tax (scheduled), RIO (scheduled),
     - Workers Comp, Job Service and Land department are being considered.

   Time and Labor – As a result of excluding the Time and Labor module during the implementation, the following shadow systems continue to operate. Each of these applications currently interfaces to ConnectND. If an enterprise Time/Labor solution is implemented these systems would be discontinued. Enterprise Architecture has sponsored

an extensive ongoing study regarding this module and intends to release a statement in late August 2006.

- Department of Transportation – PMRS
- Dept. Human Services – PMIS
- Game and Fish – Cost system
- Info. Technology Dept – WMS/Mainframe Time system
- Job Services – Time entry system

Budget Module – When first acquired, the budget module was a part of the financial application. However, early in the implementation period, PeopleSoft moved the module to the Enterprise Performance Management (EPM) application. The PeopleSoft Budget Module has been brought up in a non-production environment. However, it is not a direct match to the state's budget application (BARS). Therefore the BARS application continues to be used while the PeopleSoft budget module is further explored.

Reporting – Although a number reports were created the overall need for reports have not been satisfied. The following tools are being utilized:

- Queries – Right now, queries are being written by the Operations team and delivered for end users to run as needed. This solution does not provide much flexibility. However, PeopleSoft has built in the capabilities to export these results to MS Excel, allowing agencies the ability to manipulate the data. This doesn't work as well when an agency has to combine data from more than one query.
- PeopleSoft Query environment – This provides ad-hoc query abilities to IT Coordinators. In the original implementation, very few common reports were planned to be created because most agencies would want to create their own reports to fit their particular needs. However, midway through the implementation, the project team discovered a problem with this assumption. When you give a user access to this tool, you had to grant them access to all data in a table rather than restricting them to just their business units. We also found that this tool was more complicated than originally thought. For the future, OMB has been participating in an Enterprise Architecture study for Business Intelligence tools and sees using those in a data warehouse environment as the best way to fulfill the agencies needs.
- nVision – Used within the Financial applications is similar to excel and enables users to view data, sort and chart info. nVision reports are developed by the ConnectND project team and published for end users to run.
- Crystal reports – are used with HR and Financial applications. Crystal reporting tools enables the ConnectND project team to build specially formatted reports; an example is the accounts payable check print.

2. **Statewide Integration on a Common System:** The original 10-year estimate was $3,150,471. This savings is based upon an eventual productivity gain by employees. We have found it to be extremely difficult to measure employee productivity in some quantifiable way. Based on feedback we have received, we have anecdotal evidence that we did see some of the expected decline in productivity (as expected) as people started to learn the system.

   With that said, there are a number of reasons that we believe we have found a number of areas that we can demonstrate the value of a common system.

   - Built in interfaces between FIN & HR – There were a number of interfaces between SAMIS and ISI. Within PeopleSoft the means of integration are built in. Application messaging was configured to transfer information in real time between the PeopleSoft HR and Financial applications. All modules benefit by sending application messages or receiving them. Examples include: keeping fund tables and projects in sync and pushing employee data from HR into the vendor data in FIN (Financials).

- An enterprise portal provides single sign-on to access all necessary applications. This provides a real benefit to smaller agencies that might only have 1 or 2 people who do all of the HR and financial tasks. Those people don't have to bounce between apps and logins as they perform their daily routine.
- CAFR reporting – OMB prepares the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) each year. Under SAMIS, once the fiscal year was closed, a series of mainframe jobs were run to copy the primary mainframe files into other files and otherwise prepare the files for year end entries. All adjustments were entered into Excel, loaded onto a mainframe file and then run in to SAMIS in a nightly batch process that required closing the system. Any downloads of information from this system required mainframe jobs to be run – which had to be written or changed by programmers. Research took a considerable amount of time because the information available for viewing on the system was minimal and balance related – not transactional. Reports would have to be manually searched to find the actual transaction, and you were still limited in what you could see. Information from these downloads was then manually typed into the formal financial statements.

  Under PeopleSoft, only one process is run after fiscal year close to get the system ready for CAFR processing. Adjustments are entered and posted on-line in real time. All downloads of information are done by simple queries written by OMB personnel as needed. Research can be done on-line using queries, trial balances and inquiries that can be run on demand, and the system delivers some drilldown capabilities so you can get to the actual transaction easily. OMB estimates research time was cut in half by using PeopleSoft. The financial statements are run from PeopleSoft into an Excel file that then requires only minimal clean-up and formatting before printing.

  Agency time spent on reporting information to OMB has also decreased. Agencies are now able to run queries off PeopleSoft to download transactions to review for inclusion in reporting forms. Previously agencies had to keep manual lists as transactions were processed, or review transaction reports after that fact. Additionally, agencies no longer need to report to OMB on their fixed assets as the asset management module of PeopleSoft maintains and reports the necessary information.
- PeopleSoft Account Codes – PeopleSoft Account Codes identify the type of general ledger account (Asset, Liability, Equity, Revenue or Expenditure) and general ledger description (Cash, Income Tax Revenue, Salaries Expense, etc.) for each transaction posted in PeopleSoft. Each general ledger account is subdivided into four levels – see examples below.

Level 1	Revenue	Expenses
Level 2	Taxes	Operating Expenses
Level 3	General Sales & Use Tax	Travel
Level 4	City Sales Tax	In State Lodging

  Levels 1 through 3 are the same for both the State and University System. This provides consistency for budgeting, reporting and preparing the North Dakota Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. Prior to PeopleSoft, the State and University System had different accounting software and a different chart of accounts. Combined reports could not be produced because each was on a different accounting system and the accounting structure was not the same.

  Level 4 account codes do differ between the State and University System because each is a different type of business. For example, the University System uses a level 4 account for Student Travel which is not applicable to the State.

- Common Employee Data – The data input for a rehired or transferred employee has decreased because of PeopleSoft. All of the employee's information remains in the system so the only input required is for information that has changed. Previously in ISI if an employee transferred to another agency or was rehired by another agency the new agency would need to enter all information for this employee treating them like a newly hired State employee.

  If an employee is currently employed by the University system or was employed by them, the above is also true. Their information will remain in PeopleSoft and the only input necessary is for information that needs to be updated.

- Integrated Assets and Financial applications – Formerly, the state had a mainframe based system that some agencies were using for tracking their assets. Other agencies were using Excel, Access or other PC applications. At year end, agencies would need to report their fixed asset activity to OMB by completing a detailed form, so asset activity could be included in the statewide financial report. For some of the larger agencies, reconciling all fixed asset activity for the year and completing this form could take many days, mainly because those systems did not properly account for adjustments to existing assets, but also because they had to compile up to 11 different divisions into the one reporting form.

  OMB would then need to do a set of entries to book all the asset activity into the reporting system, and then do a separate reconciliation to ensure all adjustments were properly entered.

  With PeopleSoft, agencies are now using the PeopleSoft Asset Management module to track their assets. The module is set up so that all necessary information for the statewide financial report is sent directly to the general ledger so the agencies do not need to complete that form. While agencies do still need to review all their asset activity during the year to ensure it was entered into the system, they do not need to do the formal reconciliation as the system properly accounts for all adjustments made within the system.

  DOT used to have 5 mainframe programs and a dBase program to track their assets – they are now using only PeopleSoft and dBase, and the dBase will be discontinued soon as it is being used mainly as a backup to PeopleSoft. DOT personnel used to spend approximately 2 weeks reconciling and compiling all assets for reporting purposes – they now spend 4 days. DHS personnel used to spend approximately 3 weeks collectively on this part of year end reporting – this year it took them about 2 days.

- Vendor Files– PeopleSoft has allowed us to create a single vendor database. This system is shared by both state government and higher education. There are now consolidated and standardize processes for entering vendors into the database (minimizing the chance of a vendor being in the system multiple times). Vendor updates need only to be entered once instead of by each state agency or institution of higher education doing business with a particular vendor. It is easier for OMB to provide training and mentoring to higher education & agency personnel with entering vendors. It also helps agencies and high education in solving specific vendor problems.

3. **Establish a Self-Service Environment for Vendors:** The 10-year payback estimate was $3,018,466. During implementation it was decided to not implement this module. It would have required more resources than we had available at that time. It is still intended to be implemented as budget and resources become available allowing vendors to enter a secure site to update and/or view their information.

However, in other areas of the system we believe we have been able to bring value to the vendors that do business with the state.

- Voucher Inquiry –Vendors now have one contact to update addresses, contacts, phone numbers, ACH, bidding information, etc. This single contact can also provide information to the vendor regarding the origin of payments.

  Example: Political subdivisions (schools, cities, counties, etc.) have one contact if they want to update, correct, and/or inquire about payments made by Public Instruction, Emergency Services, Department of Transportation, and various other state agencies.

- 1099s now statewide –1099s are now issued statewide versus by each individual state agency.
  - The consolidation provides one location for vendors to contact for questions concerning their 1099s.
  - Provides training to state agencies to promote consistency in reporting.
  - One W-9 can be provided by the vendor for all state agencies and institutions of higher education.

4. **Establish a Self-Service Environment for Employees:** The ROI for this item was estimated at $5,343,784. Again we have found this to be difficult to measure. However we have been able to provide this service and are working on expanding it.

   - Current Functionality – The Portal with basic self-service lookup capability has been rolled out to all employees under the State side of ConnectND. Employees have access to view:
     - My Paycheck – Employees can view their paycheck advices. This data goes back to the beginning of the system in April of 2003. In fact, most agencies have stopped printing out paper advices for employee checks.
     - My Benefits – This allows employees to view exactly what benefit plans they are enrolled in, a description of the plan, and the level of coverage or participation.
     - My Leave Balance – This provides the ability to track leave several years back.
     - My SSN/Bank Info – As stated, this is things like bank & SSN information.

     In addition, employees now have access to view and update their own email addresses within the system.

     The email update capability serves as a pilot for further rollout of update capability; i.e. employees having the ability and responsibility to maintain their own personal data on-line.

     To date, none of the self-service rollout has required significant training effort. The functions are intuitive enough that simple instructions or guidance from active users are sufficient for new self-service users or new functionality.

   - Future functionality – More areas are planned to be released to the employees.
     - Open Enrollment – NDPERS is looking at expanding the functionality to have employees be able to perform all of the open enrollment activities on-line via the portal. This is currently a highly manual and paper intensive process.
     - Absence Management – Absence Management is currently under review for implementation following the HRMS 8.9 upgrade. Absence Management would allow significant self-service capability where employees could view their balances and leave use history in more detail and submit leave requests to

their supervisors. Supervisors would approve/deny and submit to payroll for processing.

This functionality would be a major workflow enhancement. Many agencies have expressed interest and explored options for automating leave requesting, approving, and processing.

- Candidate Gateway – Both the state government and University System have limited implementations of the Recruiting module (4 state agencies & 3 campuses). The limitation on implementation is due to the lack of automation on the front end. Entering applicant data manually is too cumbersome to be cost beneficial.

  The Candidate Gateway module allows for electronic entry of applications by the candidates. HR managers consider it very important to automate the application process because the majority of today's workforce expects to be able to apply for jobs on-line.

  The Recruiting Solutions module will not be of significant benefit (or be widely used) until we are able to implement Candidate Gateway or an alternate automated method of entering applicant information.

5. **Integrated Workflow, Industry Best Practices and Reduced Dependence on Paper:** Improvements in productivity should be the results measured on this benefit. The benefits estimated are $35,222,215 for State Government. We have been unable to measure the benefits as described in the ROI documents. What we have been able to measure is the following:

   - As noted above, most agencies have stopped printing pay advices. Most employees who have access to self service on PeopleSoft are not receiving a printed direct deposit advice. Most regular employees along with some temporary employees have access to self service. For the December 2005 paid January 2006 payroll OMB printed a total of 8,530 advices. For the June paid July 2006 payroll, the number of total advices printed was reduced to 822. The long term cost savings on this alone should be significant.
   - Abstracts – In the old SAMIS system all payments were printed on computer paper and had to be signed and then submitted to OMB for payment. With PeopleSoft, everything is online and no printout is needed to receive payment. In SAMIS we printed all Journal Vouchers, Deposits, and IDB's daily, with OMB keeping a copy and each agency receiving a copy. With PeopleSoft, all transactions are on-line and no hard copy is printed, saving on paper.
   - POs (4 copies to 1) – PeopleSoft has eliminated the printing of a four page continuous form. Purchase orders can now be emailed, faxed, or printed (requiring only one copy), depending on the agencies capabilities and policies.

6. **Platform for Re-engineering Business Practices and Continued Process Improvements:** The ROI document identified three key measurements. First is the reduction of legacy system upgrades, second is the productivity gains from re-engineered processes, and finally a benefit from getting new functionality as part of a competitive product.

   - The first measurement is based upon the number of legacy systems removed from operations. This has been discussed in item #1. We will need to continue tracking what legacy systems are removed as additional modules are rolled out.
   - While some re-engineering took place during implementation, it isn't really until now, almost two years later that we can really begin re-engineering as now we understand much better how the new system operates and how we can take advantage of that

functionality. As part of that effort, we have established user groups to share knowledge and information. We will discuss that in more detail in the next point.

- One process that was significantly reengineered was the payroll/new hire entry process. There were many complaints about the additional amount of time spend on this process. It has to be remembered that we are collecting a significant amount of additional information than we used to. We did not have a statewide HR system in the past so much of the additional data is to support new functionality. One positive aspect is that now, when hiring someone from within the system (either state or HE), their base data is already in so the amount of input is reduced. Another positive aspect is the goal of using much more extensive self-service so employees will be able to maintain their own information and enroll in benefits themselves. For the future, when we implement Candidate Gateway, much of the information entered for the hiring process will be done by the applicant/employee so ultimately the workload on HR staff should stabilize.
- Currently we are working on upgrading the HR system to version 8.9. There are a number of improvements in how the system works in the upgrade. As we hear more about the version 9.0 and Fusion product we anticipate continuing to receive the benefits of using a competitive product.

In addition we have identified some other benefits we have gained.

- Technical processes have changed:
  - The means of resolving application issues are now more dispersed as a result of accruing PeopleSoft support. With the legacy systems most issues were tracked and debugged by the supporting development staff. Now several avenues are available to determine a resolution for an application problem.
    - Example includes;
      - When the Business group determines an application function isn't performing, they can investigate the solution by reviewing PeopleSoft patches or logging customer connection cases directly with PeopleSoft. On the legacy systems the only avenue was for Developers to determine a resolution. In addition, the system administrators now debug more technical issues then they did on the mainframe systems.
      - System Administrators are now more responsible for overall system performance as well as problem resolution. They are capable of viewing the underlying platforms hosting the application and also internal application processes. They also post cases to PeopleSoft and explore resolutions via PeopleSoft's Customer Connection.
      - Developers from State government (ITD) and Higher Ed (ITSS) now have a common developer toolset to review each others' customizations and develop solutions for each others' business groups. This already been demonstrated where State developers are working with Higher Ed. project members to develop specific code for H.E.
      - Additional toolsets are used to encompass the support of the applications where each hosting site (Higher Ed. Student Admin and State HR/Fin environments) can leverage information gained from using a common toolset. As each hosting site upgrades and applies patches to the PeopleTools, information is gained and shared reducing the risk of reoccurring issues.

  - Overall by utilizing an Enterprise product it has distributed the workload and importantly the skill set to solve issues which means, a larger volume of staff with knowledge.
  - A new role called Patch Coordinator was created to specifically address upgrades and maintenance packs. The Patch Coordinator uses State Project Management methodologies to organize, plan and execute PeopleSoft application and toolset upgrades and patch cycles. This role enables the State and Higher Education a means of keeping both entities in sync as well as performing individual issues.

- Interfaces – One of the benefits to moving to PeopleSoft was that it gave OMB & ITD a chance to re-examine how they were going to go about interfacing PeopleSoft with other applications. Interface files have been standardized to have a common record layout. Overall the number of interfaces has been greatly reduced.
- Files from Mainframe to queries in PeopleSoft – Many agencies had mainframe jobs running periodically to download transaction information from SAMIS. These jobs were nightly, weekly or monthly. These jobs had to be created and maintained by ITD. Any changes to existing jobs had to be done by ITD at a cost to agencies. Now with PeopleSoft, agencies can run queries to download this same information regularly directly into Excel or Access. Some agencies can also write their own ad hoc queries as necessary. This allows agencies to get information more timely and at no additional cost.
- Electronic Workflow – With PeopleSoft all approvals for payment are done online. This allows for payments to be paid the next day if they are approved the same day that the voucher was entered into the system. With SAMIS it could take you 2 days or more to receive a check. With on-line approval there is nothing that needs to be printed before a check is created in Accounts Payable.

7. **Cross Trained Workforce:** The ROI notes that as employees move from agency to agency and since the same system is being used throughout, training time and the inherent productivity loss should be significantly reduced. The following is how we have identified the benefits for this point:

- Number of people trained in PeopleSoft – Over 1400 State employees have been trained to use various modules of the PeopleSoft Financial Management and PeopleSoft Human Capital Management applications. Once trained in a specific module or application, an employee should be able to transfer from one state agency to another with very little training because the applications are configured the same for all state agencies and the business processes are consistent between them.
- User Groups - The State has created a PeopleSoft user group for each module implemented. The user groups consist of PeopleSoft end users from all state agencies and their purpose is to promote open discussion of current problem areas to future enhancements. They provide a method for OMB to inform PeopleSoft users of future development, enhancements, upgrades, etc. They also offer a method for end users to communicate their ideas to OMB, which may result in future development. Users discuss in a round table atmosphere, problems they are encountering in hopes other users can help resolve them or provide guidance. The goal is to take a team approach to seek solutions and make the system better. User groups meet several times per year.
- Self-Service Training – As noted in the Self-Service for Employees section, very little training has been needed for employees.
- Processing P-cards – State agencies and the University System both share the same purchasing card provider and both do the same processing in PeopleSoft. The p-card provider is paid one payment each month for all state agencies, which reduces the

number of payments made each month. With the use of the purchasing card, this reduces the number of checks that are printed each month for state agencies.

- In addition, agencies and institutions could feasibly loan staff to another entity as a temporary or emergency measure. We have already realized some benefit in this area as Higher Ed has hired several of the ITD CND developers on a part-time basis to assist them in catching up on some of their backlogged development requests.

Other Benefits:

We are also realizing benefits from other areas not directly related to the application. Many of these were also identified in the ROI.

- Migration to Browser-based Architecture: This has brought about many improvements. One significant benefit is that employees can work from just about anywhere. Many of the OMB employees are able to log in from home to correct an issue instead of having to come into the office at midnight. All one needs to access any PeopleSoft Application is a web browser and an authorized login. This is particularly helpful when one is away from the workplace and needs to view a report, approve a voucher, submit a process, etc. It doesn't matter if one is out of the state or at home, except for scheduled downtimes, PeopleSoft is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.
- Common Coding Structures: As noted above, ITD and the University system can share developers as needed.
- Meet Government Reporting Requirements: This was covered in the CAFR reporting bullet in item #2.
- Software Available to Local Government and K-12: At this point we are not aware of any entity using our purchase to install their own instance, but we have received some inquiries and still see a possible future of ITD providing this as a service in a similar model to Power School for K-12.
- Flexibility to Meet a Wide Range of Business Process Requirements: The only area that we have had difficulty meeting business requirements has been in the Time and Labor module. While it is believed that PeopleSoft Time & Labor could provide the needed requirements, many key agencies disagree. Without that buy-in it is unlikely that OMB will pursue deploying the PeopleSoft solution. It would be tough not to recognize that Higher Ed has experienced significant difficulties with the Grants and Contracts module. State government is using a different process to manage its grants and so have not had the same difficulties. (State Government's needs were quite different from Higher Ed's needs.)
- Extensive Support for Integration to Complementary Software: Because PeopleSoft was a dominant player in the ERP arena; many 3rd party applications already had devised "hooks" to transfer data between PeopleSoft and their app. Since Oracle's acquirement of PeopleSoft the likelihood that others will create their own "hooks" has only increased. What this means is that the state does not have to create and support another interface lowering our costs.

KEY PROJECT METRICS

Cost

The state government portion of the project came in about 21% over budget. There were two areas that make up the bulk of that overrun.

	Budget	Cost	Diff

PeopleSoft Software	2,279,738.82	2,282,103.00	2,364.18
Implementation	9,806,014.65	9,806,014.65	0
Amendments		948,705.41	948,705.41
Equipment/Hosting	756,850.00	616,339.00	(140,511.00)
Staffing/Training	1,732,407.00	3,956,901.18	2,224,494.18
Totals	14,575,010.47	17,610,063.24	3,035,052.77
% Difference			21%

The first area is amendments, which accounts for almost $1 million of the total $3 million overrun. There were three (3) amendments that composed most of the budget changes.

1. Amendment #1 - 325,628. This amendment allowed Maximus to host the applications while we were in development and to assist the state in creating our hosting environment. This amendment benefited both the State and Higher Ed. *It was paid from the original general fund appropriation for ConnectND in the 2001-03 biennium.*
2. Amendment #3 - $450,000. When the state decided not to go to semi-monthly payrolls, but rather stay at monthly payrolls with no lag, this amount paid for the customizations for that change. *Paid by OMB.*
3. Amendment #8 - $90,000. The financials go-live date for the State was originally scheduled for September 2004, but the decision was made to extend the go live date by one month primarily to make federal financial reporting easier for state agencies. *Paid by OMB.*

The other area of overruns was Staffing/Training, accounting for $2.2 million of the overrun. This is primarily additional ITD staff time applied to the project. It should be noted that most of these were FTEs ITD already had devoted to the legacy systems or other projects. While it is important to track this information in order to better plan for future projects, these people would have likely been assigned to other projects. The ROI document noted that if ConnectND had not been done, many other projects would have been required. For example, the payroll system would have had to been replaced anyway. The FTEs in this line item would have likely been assigned to those projects. In other words, these are costs that would have been paid by the state anyway, not additional expenses incurred.

Schedule

All schedule changes were based in one of the amendments noted in the cost section. Overall, the project did not set a lot of clear milestones that were measured against. A lesson learned is to have the vendor detail the critical milestones better and have true measurement against those milestones. With that said, the project did meet the overall schedule deadlines after accounting for the amendment changes.

	Start Date	Scheduled End Date	Actual End Date	Difference	% Variance
Original Schedule	April 2002	June 2004	Sept 2004	3 months	12%

The dates above are implementation dates with an anticipated post implementation support planned through 3rd quarter of 2004. Actual support was adjusted via the amendments to limit the cost impact. Support was only a little over a month long with partial support supplied as needed in the following month.

Scope

The following is the state government portion of the scope as specified in the project charter.

- Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, Asset Management, Billing, Budget Planning, e-Procurement, General Ledger, Inventory, Projects, Grants Management and Purchasing modules of the PeopleSoft Financials suite (FIN)

  During the project, state government determined not to implement the e-Procurement and Grants Management modules.

  The expense module was added to the scope of implementation and deployed to pilot agencies.

  The EPM budget module was piloted but determined not to be deployed as part of the implementation.

- Human Resources, Benefit Administration, Flexible Spending Administration, Payroll, and Time and Labor modules of the PeopleSoft HRMS suite (HRMS)

  As noted above, Time & Labor was not rolled out due to the decision not to commit to a change in payroll schedule and incorporating a lag in payment. Other than that, all of the planned scope was completed.

  Recruit work force and training module were added to the scope of implementation.

- Government Portal – This area was completed with a staggered rollout to the general employee population as e-Applications were implemented.

- During the implementation it was realized that a number of developers would be working for a variety of entities and would impact each others' code if it were not organized. Due to the volume of developers and varied performing groups a Version control product called STAT was added to the scope of implementation. Although outside of the cost and implementation estimates it was a key tool to avoid overlaps/over written code. It also enabled teams to follow a standardized and automated means for approving and migrating development objects across test environments and then into production.

Quality

In general, the project lacked a consistent set of quality measurements. However, quality should be examined in several ways.

- Project Quality relates to how well we did in following good project management practices. From an overall standpoint, very little emphasis was placed on measuring quality of project processes. There were project plans and schedules, but they were seldom maintained appropriately. At one point three different issue logs were being used simultaneously.
- Technological Quality is another factor that needs to be examined. From a technical standpoint, the state technical team did place a large degree of effort on quality control regarding data conversions, unit testing and system integration. But they also had gaps in that area. For example, the QA testing was conducted but no authoritative controls were in place to freeze code changes between Higher Ed. and State during the staggered go live dates.
- Product Quality should be the end result of the above two quality items, but it also covers areas that could be missed above. For example measuring the number of problem paychecks in the payroll rollout. Or how many problems were there in creating the first CAFR report. In the ConnectND project, even though we didn't do a very good job of defining what "good" looks like as an end product, the project team did a pretty good job of inserting a level of quality into the project. However, there was a very rough period in the months following the rollout. There were conflicts in scheduling of processes, application

failures, and not enough reports. On the other hand, several quality issues were managed well. Below are some examples of both:

- The state's first payroll cycle on PeopleSoft went very well. Between the advanced and supplemental payrolls the state processed a total of 10,210 checks and advices. There were only a total of 38 manual checks and 18 reversals.
- People were surprised that the apparent speed of the web based system is not as fast as the mainframe system. Because this was not addressed in quality and organizational change management, end users were unprepared for the change and were unhappy with the performance right after the rollout. Since then, updates and patches have been applied that have improved the performance, but it still does not match the apparent speed of the mainframe system.
- Another quality issue was process scheduling. Even though we combined state government and higher education into a single system, the scheduling of processes between the entities was not accounted for very well. This was not an easy task and we still struggle with it some today. Processes took forever to run. We had to coordinate our run schedule with the University System and it was not until ITD re-indexed some tables that we saw an improvement. Today, some processing still takes a very long time to run and we are working at solutions to this problem.
- In a related matter, one of the bigger problems the state implementation faces was when the system said processes completed successfully but in reality they did not. The process would run successfully but would fail to post or app message transactions to the proper files. This caused us to be out of sync between tables. This was one of our biggest problems; we were reconciling PeopleSoft tables on a daily basis. Once we determined tables were out of sync, we had to research how to fix them. We have since developed queries to help us reconcile the tables within PeopleSoft.
- There were some early struggles with vendor payments. Since the vendor database is used by purchase orders and vouchers, how the information is entered is critical to these modules. Unfortunately, training on the database was not very thorough. A lot time was spent determining how things worked or didn't work. It was unclear how everything worked together until the system went live. The largest complaint was the setup for ACH payments. (Note: This was a fairly common complaint. People could handle the normal processes, but when troubleshooting a failed transaction, a lack of understanding the underlying system caused a lot of frustration. This can be linked to a lack of quality training processes.)
- The preparation of the CAFR (Comprehensive Annual Financial Report) is an example of both pluses and minuses. First, the reporting process has become more efficient. Moving from the mainframe system to PeopleSoft allowed for real-time updating of data and the elimination of cumbersome mainframe batch jobs. Additionally, the creation of data downloads has moved from ITD programmers to OMB accountants, which allows for more timely and in-depth analysis of data. The PeopleSoft system also allows much greater flexibility in the report presentation and rollup, and reports can be run directly into Excel whereas the old system required re-keying data into Excel spreadsheets. On the negative side, the system configuration for accounting entries does not accurately report year-end accruals so many more entries and additional time is required to get certain payable and receivable accounts properly reported.

The lack of people, schedule and budget all played a role in the limited role of quality in the project. This area should be much better defined in future projects.

Post-Implementation Report

Lessons Learned:

Many lessons learned are covered elsewhere in this document. This section is to highlight some of the major ones and provide some additional detail.

- We have celebrated that North Dakota completed this project with less resources, less money, and less time than anyone else. It is something we can be proud of. There is a price paid for that however. Staff put in tremendous hours and was stretched extremely tight leading to a very high stress environment for long periods of time. Some issues were put on the backburner to be addressed after go-live because we didn't have the staff or money to do them earlier. We need to plan and budget for contingencies and risks that occur. Often the best method of doing something was not an option because of schedule and budget constraints.
- One of the top lessons learned is that project management is critical to the success of the project. This role cannot just be assigned to the knowledge expert. The people who were assigned this role did their absolute best considering most had no training or experience in formal project management. They were constantly pulled from between their role as an SME and module (or technical) lead and their duties as project managers. This project was complex and big enough to have supported 2-3 sub-project managers. Project management is designed to help compensate and overcome many of the issues that this project faced. And this also ties to the next lesson learned.
- A vendor should not be hired for overall project management for a project that they are also the primary contractor. Project Management can and should be a component of the deliverables by the vendor, but a state or other 3rd party person should be responsible for the overall project. The primary role of the project manager should be to integrate budget, scope and schedule. The vendor did not have adequate information to manage the budget, nor should they be given this responsibility. We must have put the vendor's overall Project Manager in some very difficult spots almost having to divide himself into what his "state" brain knew vs. what his "company" brain knew. It is best if the person representing the state and having authority over the success of the entire project be unaffiliated with the performing vendor.
- An executive from the vendor should be a member of the Executive Steering Committee (ESC). There are actually 2 lessons in this statement. First, the vendor is a part of the ESC. Second, the appropriate member to attend is not the Project Manager or senior member of the team on location, (unless needed for a particular issue) but is an executive who has the authority to make the deals necessary at this level.
- ESC meetings should be held on a regular basis. Monthly would be a good baseline to start with. It is easier to cancel meetings like this then schedule them. However, even if the news is all good, there is value to be had by just having the senior management of all the important stakeholders talk with each other.
- In future projects, we need better controls in the contract regarding Risk & Quality. At the time we began this project, our relative maturity in these key project management processes was fairly low. We needed to do a better job of identifying and managing risk. We also need to ensure the controls are in place to have better control of the quality of the project.
- Along the same lines, we needed to do better at organizational change management. The project did a fairly good job of managing the organizational changes within OMB and ITD. However, it did not do a very good job of managing organizational changes within the agencies. As mentioned in several places above, the next project should examine the methodology used to implement or come up with better way to engage users so there are no surprises during end-user training.

- Do not underestimate the power of a report –It is clear that more time should have been spent on designing reports. Reports & queries remain a primary sore spot for agencies. As noted above, a security issue was discovered late in the project that prevented the project from delivering the anticipated access to ad-hoc queries. Without this access, pre-built reports become much more important and there just wasn't time to build them.

  What happened was that in order to maintain appropriate security, the project had to ban access to certain tables rather than individual data elements as planned. In other words, they could not restrict a DOT employee to have access to just DOT data within a table, it was all or nothing. Following implementation, the ConnectND operational team took a number of steps to address the issue. Reporting and information access continues to be a high priority addressed in the ConnectND Strategic Plan.

- Budget development and reporting on the project started rather weakly but improved as time went on. Because there was little linkage between, budget, schedule and scope, and individual budgets were maintained by the organizations involved rather than at a project level. Initially only costs specifically appropriated to the project were included, not reallocated dollars. At some point during the project, an effort was made to follow best practices of tracking all project costs. This could have been avoided by developing a detailed work breakdown structure (WBS) and estimating costs based on the detailed scope and schedule.

Closing:

In general, the state government portion of the implementation went relatively smooth. The project team was able to handle most of the issues with out a significant impact to schedule or cost. It is anticipated that we will see progressively more value as we become more comfortable with the system.

Survey Results

As part of the project evaluation process, a survey was sent to state project team members and subject matter experts. The results are summarized below:

A. PRODUCT EFFECTIVENESS

Overall Survey Rating: 2.3

Survey Comments:

How well does the product or service of the project meet the stated needs of the Performing Organization?

- Seems it provides the tools necessary, just not always in a manner more efficient than the previous systems provided.
- There are some flaws and complaints about the system, but then I would ask in which system of this size isn't there?
- System provides more comprehensive HR data and functionality than the prior payroll system. Continued development and additional modules will move this rating to "3."
- Payroll meets the needs of the users. Time and Labor once rolled out will meet more of the needs of the users as well as self-service.

- Inventory – When we went live – this was an inadequate program. Over the course of the last 16 months, it is beginning to perform but is difficult to get information out of. Items weren't even mentioned except a footnote at the beginning of inventory training. "This is inventory training, NOT items training." I had no idea what that meant and didn't figure it out until months into the process.
- Asset Management – This is a very powerful program and can handle to a great extent the needs of 90% of the users. To large agencies like NDDOT, there are some areas that are cumbersome. Workable, but cumbersome.

How well does the product or service of the project meet your needs?

- I need work; it provides plenty of it.
- Inventory – Again, we are working out the bugs and still doing a lot of work-arounds. Part of this module is very powerful and other parts are lacking significantly.
- Asset Management – When you dispose of an asset, the depreciation should show right there. Right now we have to go to the cost/depreciation section to find the depreciation. When you are dealing with hundreds of disposals, this is tremendously time consuming. (Need the depreciation to calculate the gain/loss on sale)

When initially implemented, how well did the product or service of the project meet the stated needs of the Performing Organization?

- Lots of customizations were implemented to get it performing the way it was needed for the agencies.
- Initial implementation focused on payroll. Initial payrolls were processed with no significant increase in errors.
- Additional work needed to be done for reports and queries for the agencies.
- Inventory – Totally inadequate. I believe that inventory was set up wrong (and later consultants agree) yet it is too late to fix. So the work-arounds continue.
- Asset Management – Reporting problems were/are the concern. Not enough lead time for insuring reports that would work best for the agencies. The report requests were written up in April 2004, but not completed until December 2005. This made initial physical inventory a chore for large agencies.

What is your overall assessment of the outcome of this project?

- The project itself went very well. Once everyone is past the growing pains of a new system I think it'll be looked upon as a good move. Customers are still adjusting at this point.
- Conservative staffing is resulting in a lengthy time to add additional functionality – as functionality is added, the result will attain a "3."
- Payroll's outcome was good.
- Inventory – After months of work, I would now say this is adequate. I am hoping that once some accurate reports are written, we could move to a higher level of competency, but as of today, the reporting capability is inadequate. We are still working out the bugs to get inventory to write to GL that, as of 2/7/06, hasn't happened yet.
- Asset Management – A very powerful program, and so much better than what we had. Successful outcome.

B. CSSQ MANAGEMENT

Separating project groups into Higher Education and State kept each group focused on their own deliverables. Joint decisions were facilitated by Maximus which assured a decision was reached. After Maximus left, the cohesiveness between Higher Ed. and State project teams left as well.

The Project team organization worked very well. Establishing project managers by Application (HR and Fin) and Technical with matching counterparts clearly outlined who was responsible for

decisions within the project team. This structure continues in the operation mode and has been incorporated into the Operational Governance agreement.

Quality management was not well defined in the Statement of Work. The state relied on Maximus for project management leadership as the state's project management understanding was still in its infancy. There was no quality management plan. Future projects need to make sure that a quality management plan is in place to make sure quality assurance is developed and quality controls are in place. With that said, the overall quality of the product delivered on the state government side was good.

The full impact of changes was not understood. Cost and timelines were outlined but the far reaching effect on functionality was realized only afterwards. Examples include: not incorporating a pay lag and eliminating Time and Labor from the scope.

Below are some of the comments from the survey

Overall Survey Rating: 2.2

Survey Comments:

How well did the scope of the project match what was defined in the Project Proposal?

- (It worked) fairly well. There were a few curveballs with Time & Labor, Payroll, etc.
- We were on time and on budget, except for the payroll lag decision, and that was out of our control.
- There were some scope changes as the State learned more about the functionality of some modules.

How satisfied are you with your involvement in the development and/or review of the Project Scope during Project Initiation and Planning?

- I feel I was kept well informed of the scope at the outset and throughout the project.

Was the Change Control process properly invoked to manage changes to Cost, Scope, Schedule, or Quality?

- I think we did very well with documenting the additional time and cost requirements of scope and schedule changes.
- Yes, the change control processes worked properly.

Was the established change budget adequate?

- The only problem pertained to the payroll lag decision which cost us 3 months of post production support from Maximus. This hurt us on the backend after we rolled out statewide.
- Yes, although additional staffing and/or budget would have enhanced implementation.

How effectively was the Quality Management Plan applied during Project Execution?

- We had a Quality Assurance Management Plan?
- The University System tested in their environments; the State in ours. QA was fine in our own environments, but we ran into problems when we migrated to PROD. Frequently, Univ. Sys. Migrations broke State processes and vice versa. Should have had one QA for both entities before going to PROD.

How effective was the quality assurance process?

- Minimal errors experienced during implementation.

How effective was the utilization of Best Practices from prior projects in the Performing Organization?

- Best practice – Vanilla Implementation and Resistance to Change often clashed – to be expected.
- Best Practices were evaluated throughout the implementation of PeopleSoft payroll.

C. RISK MANAGEMENT

Risk management was not well defined in the Statement of Work. Again, the state relied on Maximus for project management leadership as the state's project management understanding was still immature. That lack of understanding stands out in the survey comments found below. There was no risk management plan. Future projects need to make sure that a risk management plan is in place. The decision to not put a lag in payroll was a risk that should have been identified earlier and mitigation plans put in place. That could have saved the project several weeks of delay.

Overall Survey Rating: 2.1

Survey Comments:

How effectively was the Risk Management Log updated or reviewed?

- Status and Issue log filled this role and was updated on a 1-2 week schedule, based on project needed.

How comprehensive was the Risk Management Log? (i.e. did many events occur that were never identified?)

- Very few that could have been foreseen.

D. COMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT

Communication within the project team was actually quite good overall. However, the project often struggled in its communication to the agencies. The project had a web site, but it tended to be dominated by Higher Ed as the state government side didn't utilize it to the fullest extent.

Some of the comments below noted the lack of senior management involvement in the early stages of the project. The senior management of several agencies became involved only in the late stages of the project, after many of the critical decisions were made. The implementation methodology we used likely played a role with this. We used a typical waterfall development methodology where requirements were gathered, design was performed, development occurred, and it wasn't until testing that most people had a chance to really see how things worked. Because this was a completely new approach to how we were doing business, most people often had a difficult time visualizing the changes that were occurring and the impact of the decisions that were made early on. It wasn't until they were testing & training that they saw and understood that impact. Then they raised their concerns, which eventually brought in the senior management. If we had a more rapid development cycle, where these processes are done quickly at a high level, a prototype is turned out early in the process so users could get a better feel how the new system works and how their decisions impacted the end product, we probably would have not experienced as much of this issue and some of the other communication problems experienced. It should be noted that the rapid development methodology was just really starting to become mainstream at the time we began this project and no one in the state really had experience with this it. Future large projects replacing major legacy systems should take a look at that methodology.

Early on, the project decided to use FileNet as the project's repository. This decision, as you will see from some of the comments below, proved to be a struggle for staff. Most people were not familiar with the product, so they found the interface difficult to use. There were enough technical issues early on to sour many folks trying to use the system. In the end, e-mailing large files was still a common process in the project. An easier to use interface or a better collaboration tool should be used in the future.

Overall Survey Rating: 2.3

Survey Comments:

How effective were the informational materials available to orient team members?

- Commitment Accounting (CA) ranked a 1; Cost Allocation, Fixed Assets ranked as 2's.

- I personally could have benefited from more orientation at the front of the project.
- Could have been improved.

How effectively was the project team meetings conducted?

- Team meetings amongst the State's team were very effective and helpful.
- Weekly meetings kept everybody informed.
- Most meetings were organized, efficient and productive.
- They were effective.

How effectively were stakeholders involved in the project?

- Agency upper level management did not get as involved as they should have.
- Lack of involvement by upper management at agency level early on.
- With the project conversions, we had some issues with getting the information needed in a timely manner.
- Conducted BPA's and met individually with most agencies to configure models.
- High level agency (various) personnel often chose to not be involved.
- Main stakeholders were effectively involved. Decentralized nature or operations did limit involvement by some smaller entities.

Was communication with stakeholders adequate?

- Could have been better. After BPA's were conducted, very little global communications were sent out.
- We should have done a better job of communicating with State Agencies.
- Mostly, yes, some more follow-up is necessary.

How well were your expectations met regarding the frequency and content of information conveyed to you by the Project Manager?

- The project team was located in the same area and was very well aware of what everybody was doing.
- Regular staff meetings were also held.

How well was project status communicated throughout your involvement in the project?

- Having everybody in one location kept everyone very informed with each other.
- Sometimes status was reported for the sake of reporting rather than covering substantive info.

How well were project issues communicated throughout your involvement in the project?

- Bi-weekly issue meeting to keep everyone updated were very helpful.
- If there were problems, the affected agencies were contacted and included in discussions.
- After FIN went live, there was a lack of communication among functional staff with issues.
- Issue logs were effective.

How well did the Project Manager respond to your questions or comments related to the project?

- I think that the State Team as a whole worked very well together and responded timely.
- Project Manager was always available and in the same location.
- HR – did not always see results.

How useful was the format and content of the Project Status Report to you?

- Rarely saw it (assuming this was the high level report for entire projects).

How useful and complete was the project repository?

- FileNet was not user friendly at all.
- I did not refer to many documents contained in the repository other than some development requests.
- Personally I find FileNet to be cumbersome, particularly regarding its search capability.

- FileNet proved useful for storage or organization of documentation, but it was fussy and inconvenient at times.
- FileNet was not good. STAT was decent. Switching from FileNet to STAT with other permutations within there was not good.
- Very difficult and inconsistent to use (FileNet).
- Could have been improved somewhat but overall good – if I recall correctly – mainly finding where things were at.

E. ACCEPTANCE MANAGEMENT

In the early phases of the project where documents were the deliverables, acceptance management was well defined and in general enough time was allocated to review. However, when it came to the actual application deliverables, they were a lot more difficult to define. Just now, 2 years later, are we starting to understand "how" some things are being done. Again, perhaps a rapid development methodology may have helped with this issue, but that is less than certain.

Overall Survey Rating: 2.2

Survey Comments:

How effective was the acceptance management process?

- With responsibility for HR project Mgmt, this is an area that would have benefited from more initial orientation.

How complete/effective were the materials you were provided in order to make a decision to proceed from one project lifecycle phase to the next?

- Maximus provided great expertise and helped our team make good decisions on business practices.

F. ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT

In a project of this size and complexity, this was a very difficult subject. As noted in section A, in some cases we just now understand enough about the system to start making some business process changes. On the other hand, the project did force many business processes to be examined. The system handled the routine processes fine, but when it came to the exceptions, that is where changes often had to be made. Could this have been done better? Certainly. However, based upon funding and scheduling issues, the project did what they could with what they had available. For example, it would have been nice to run parallel for a quarter so people could transition into the new system easier. However, the workload involved would have been huge and there was no funding for that sort of effort. This is definitely an area we need to work on in future projects.

Overall Survey Rating: 2.2

Survey Comments:

How effectively and timely was the organizational change impact identified and planned for?

- Not a strong point of the project.
- PR was good; CA was not so good.
- In general, the "vanilla" implementation was communicated early and often and was accepted by most agencies. Some resistance is inevitable and probably could not have been overcome, i.e., payroll cycle and some entrenched agency processes. Change management needs to be a continued focus through review of business processes during upgrades.

How pro-active was the Organizational Change Management Plan?

- Agencies were very active in the Business Process Analysis and Fit Sessions

Was sufficient advance training conducted/information provided to enable those affected by the changes to adjust to and accommodate them?

- Just in-time training.
- We thought we trained adequately, but found some users needed much more. Others did pretty well with what was delivered.

Overall, how effective were the efforts to prepare you and your organization for the impact of the product/service of the project?

- As well as could be expected.
- As well as could be expected.
- Incurred mostly system problems-not user problems.
- As well as could be expected.
- PeopleSoft training was provided but from there we were on our own. No training was provided by Maximus consultants.

How effective were the techniques used to prepare you and your organization for the impact of the changes brought about by the product or service of the project?

- Maximus kept us very informed on all matters.
- It was adapt as you go process.

G. ISSUES MANAGEMENT

In general, most issues were handled in a timely matter. The project effectively used the issue log to manage open issues. Most delays in resolving issues was usually due to the differences between state government and higher education, as you will see in some of the comments below.

The issue with payroll lag was the only major issue that impacted the overall timeline on the state government part of the project. The final one month shift in schedule was a combination of responding to some concerns being expressed by some of the end users and a clear cut accounting decision that making the cut at the end of a fiscal quarter and federal fiscal year made more sense than having 11 months of federal reporting data in one system and 1 month in another.

Overall Survey Rating: 2.3

Survey Comments:

How effectively were issues managed on the project?

- I believe communication and cooperation from Higher Ed could have been better.
- All the issues were discussed in weekly meetings and prioritized.
- Very few issues escalated above the Project Management team.
- Anytime we differed with HIED, it was a headache.
- The magnitude of the project made some major issues inevitable, but the issue log provided a logical process to work toward resolution by keeping focused on the issue.
- Issues were handled appropriately. Management was good.

How effectively were issues resolved before escalation was necessary?

- The issues were worked on depending on their priority. At times production support issues would prevent other issues getting resolved in a timely manner and then the priorities would have to change.
- They were handled appropriately before escalation by HR Project Manager.

If issue escalation was required, how effectively were issues resolved?

- Critical issues were normally resolved in a timely manner.

How effectively were issues able to be resolved without impacting the Project Schedule or Budget?

- This is with exception to the payroll lag issue.
- Phase 2 was affected by the pay-cycle decision.
- The payroll lag decision had an adverse impact on our rollout date.
- Payroll lag revocation impacted everything but that was beyond our control.

H. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND TRANSITION

This area was the lowest rated area in the survey. Unfortunately a lot of the responses appear to have been based upon pre/early project training rather than implementation & transition training. This project used a process of just-in-time training. That method was not well received by the end users. Again, going back to the development methodology, for many of the end users this is the first time they saw what some of the decisions they had made in the prior year meant. Even if we had not used a different development methodology we should have held some review classes earlier in the schedule with some key stakeholders. It would have allowed us to address some of their concerns earlier instead of right at implementation time. This is really where the tight schedule had a big impact. A lot of development was still going on right up to training, limiting our ability to do the previous suggestion.

Overall Survey Rating: 1.9

Survey Comments:

How effective was the documentation that you received with the project product/service?

- I refer to PeopleSoft training – too much info in a small period of time. Too many modules at once.
- Acceptable, with more time, the documentation could have been stronger to detail the specifics of our implementation.
- Asset Management – This would have gone much better if I could have done the training.

How effective was the training you received in preparation for the use of the product/service?

- I did not receive any formal training.
- Training was not a strong point and focus of the project. How is UPK working now?
- Some training was not provided and if provided, it was not user friendly – Strategic Sourcing, 1099's, Vendor Database, Workflow Administration, PO rollover.
- PeopleSoft training units – too much to absorb at once.
- We could have used more training.
- Commitment accounting, Cost Allocation – none; Asset Management – good.
- Project Team attended initial HRMS training with no familiarity w/PeopleSoft. We spent most of the time scrambling to keep up with navigation. Most knowledge came from "knowledge transfer" from Maximus. Some later training for payroll and tech staff was more effective.
- Not very effective. Learned on your own. Better training or hands on training would have been useful.

How useful was the content of the training you received in preparation for the use of the product/service?

- I did not receive any formal training.
- Training was not a strong point and focus of the project. How is UPK working now?
- Best training was provided by Maximus.
- AM-Training focused more on data entry and set-up – not as much on processing, which is OMB's biggest part of it.
- The manuals received from PeopleSoft training was a resource, but not always usable in our environment – meaning State government.

How timely was the training you received in preparation for the use of the product/service?

- AM – Circumstances – I attended Asset training, but did little with implementation due to payroll issues – I didn't start Asset stuff until over 1 ½ year after training.
- Good – it was prior to implementation.

How effective was the support you received during implementation of the product/service?

- Both Maximus and the ITD Development team were very supportive. They could not have been any more knowledgeable or helpful.
- Everyone on the Project Team was helpful and the ITD Developers were very helpful.
- PeopleSoft support at times doesn't respond as fast as they could to issues. Online support was very helpful at times.
- We could have used Maximus here for a longer period of time. Our post-production was too short!
- IT support was great – helping clean up conversion issues; not involved in the rest of implementation.
- Maximus support was very strong for the most part, although staffing seemed tight at times.
- Good on the State side. Maximus was a good leader to get the process rolling and get the essentials. There was some difficulty getting things done with Maximus for issues that were State specific. Lists were given and not followed up on. Reminders were necessary on a continual basis. We did get them accomplished eventually, just took extra effort on the State side to get the job done. There was little if any direction given for the process needed for parallel testing. The IT team and the module leads worked together to figure it out. The support needed by Maximus after roll out was good.
- Asset Management – Kirk Reynolds was fabulous. If I had a question or concern, it was remedied timely.

I. PERFORMANCE OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION

The Office of Management & Budget and the Information Technology Department were the two primary performing agencies with help from many Subject Matter Experts across many agencies.

The Project Sponsor Committee, with representation from the Governor's Office and the Legislature, worked very well. It allowed the project to discuss successes and challenges with key political leadership to ensure that they were getting a good picture of the project and that any concerns that they had could be addressed.

The Executive Steering Committee for the state government implementation was a small group consisting of the Director of OMB, the CIO, and the Governor's Chief of Staff. This allowed for solid effective decision-making. However, as noted in one of the first survey comments below, it probably would have been good to have included the heads of a couple of the larger agencies so they could be involved in the decision process and to help champion the project within their agencies.

The Project Director for state government became the acting director of OMB (and eventually took the position) early on in the project. This impacted the amount of time she could spend working on the project. Some tasks had to be pushed down to the project managers. The impact of this is discussed in the next section. Again, everyone did the best that they could with what they had, but looking back, we probably should have replaced that position.

Production vs. Project – While this issue was not as severe as that experienced on the Higher Ed side, there were conflicts between providing production support and performing project steps. The low staffing of the project meant that the same people had to do both items. The upside of this was that there really wasn't much "transition" between the project and the performing organization as they were the same people.

Overall Survey Rating: 2.3

Survey Comments:

How effectively and consistently was sponsorship for the project conveyed?

- I would have expanded the Steering Committee to include the 3-4 largest agencies (DOT, DHS ...). May have helped with resolving complaints and setting expectations.

How smooth was the transition of support from the Project Team to the Performing Organization?

- I thought this was very smooth, because a large portion of the performing organization was a member of the project team.
- It was tough when Phase I was transitioning to Phase 2. With a Phase 2 project, there probably should have been more team members to allow for separation of duties: 1) Production Support 2) Project Support.
- Same people, so not a "true" transition.
- The project team and the Performing Organization is still the same group.
- Still a work in progress with State Agencies.
- HR was smoother than FIN.
- Essentially, the project team became the performing organization. Some difficulties have become apparent in splitting time between implementation and operation.
- There wasn't a clear direction as to whether we were still in project mode or to perform as "usual." I am not certain we were ever not in project mode in my time at OMB. There was uncertainty as to who issues should be reported to, meaning to the Dept. head or to the Project Manager when issues arose (depending on the issue). Everyone was good to work as a team and get the issue resolved, just not real clean on who to report it to so it was reported to OMB heads and project manager.

Was there a qualitative difference in the level of support provided by the Project Team during implementation and by the Performing Organization after transition?

- IT was consistent from my perspective.
- No. I believe the level was similar due to it being similar people.
- Support is still being supplied by the same group.
- Very intense after rollout.
- No, same support team.
- No, it was the same either way. The team was exceptional to work with.

Did the Project Team adequately plan for and prepare the Performing Organization for its ongoing responsibilities for the product or service of the project?

- Yes. Very strong support Team. One area of improvement would have been patching support and migration support. It seemed to take time to perform these tasks at times.
- Performing Organization staff was an integral part of the Project Team.
- Support is still being supplied by the same group.
- We know we'd be in trouble with only 3 months of post production support from Maximus, but nothing we could to about it.
- Same people.
- I don't believe there was enough time to review that. I think it was unknown because we were "implementing" throughout, even after rollout we were responding to issues as they arose and deciding the best way to correct the situation and progress forward.

J. PERFORMANCE OF PROJECT TEAM

Early on in the project it was identified that we really needed an experienced project manager dedicated full-time to the project. Unfortunately, there was neither the FTE nor the budget to hire one. Therefore many of the project management responsibilities were pushed down to the key project leads. They had to split their time between their project lead responsibilities and their project management responsibilities. As noted above, with the project director having to push

some responsibilities down, this conflict became even greater. Most of these people had no formal project management training and they did not receive any during the project.

With all of that said, the state government project team performed quite well. Streamlined decision process and the experience of many of the Maximus consultants in doing a similar sized government type implementation likely played key roles in this. One of the consultants assigned to the state government financial side also seemed to have the most project management experience and was able to better guide the implementation.

The inventory module was probably one of the weakest in the project. Only one agency was really interested in the module. The project team did not provide a lot of support to the Module Lead. Unfortunately, as noted in some of the comments below, the consultant for that module was also not very effective. This module continues to be one of the weakest in the system. OMB continues to work to improve the Inventory Module today.

Overall Survey Rating: 2.4

Survey Comments:

Overall, how effective was the performance of the Project Manager?

- The State team worked very well together and I believe that reflects on the Project Manager or Managers.
- Status meetings help track open items and direct effort.
- Very good.
- We had an excellent team.
- HR lacking at times.
- Good.
- Inventory – Maximus representative refused to do anything about repeated complaints regarding the consultant.
- Asset Management – Maximus representative stayed out of our way and that was his biggest contribution.

How well did the Project Team understand the expectations of their specific roles and responsibilities?

- There must have been some misunderstanding about their decision-making authority in regard to changing the pay-cycle.
- The people on the Project Team were divided up within the various modules.
- Very well. This was a very aggressive project, and we completed it on time. Everybody knew what they had to do to be successful.
- Thought the project team worked well together.
- More early orientation on the processes would have helped us to understand more quickly.
- Inventory – Pieces would work, but not together. Granted some of these were PeopleSoft problems, but most were people problems.
- Asset Management – Great. Each team member worked on the part that he/she knew best and went to the consultant for guidance when in doubt.

How well were your expectations met regarding the extent of your involvement in the project (effort time commitments etc.)?

- Knew up front it would be a challenge and we did put in mega hours.
- My expectations were met.
- Inventory – The week we went live, the consultant still had not given any guidance to how to setup the cost portion of the inventory.
- Asset Management – Kirk basically laid out what would be required and we set a reasonable time table and were able to meet our own deadlines.

How effective was each Project Team member in fulfilling his/her role?

- There were a couple of members that really did not fulfill their roles, but the other team members picked up the slack.
- Would have liked to have seen more expertise from Maximus. Some of their staff was inexperienced (Time and Labor) or not always very effective (Technical).
- With a few rare exceptions.
- Some did excellent jobs, while others were not as involved as they should have been.
- All were very good with one particular exception.
- Very well. This was an aggressive project and we completed it on time. Everyone knew what they had to do to be successful.
- Most team members did their duties – a couple were lacking.
- State HR had outstanding module leads in the core functions; payroll (Melanni/Lori), benefits (Sharon S.), Commitment Accounting (Jill), and Tech (Kevin, Lara, Anita, Agnes, and Vern).
- Inventory – mod lead – first time in career didn't meet goal on project.
- Asset Management – Working with Kirk Reynolds and Jill Schaefer was very agreeable. We worked well together drawing on each of our strengths and bowing to the one with the most experience.

How effective was team member training?

- Very good.
- Training was OK. But in the end, it's up to the team member to put in the time and effort to learn. The training is just a small piece of it. It's what the member does with it afterwards that counts.
- Again we could have used more training.
- Inventory – Nothing worked . . . hard to train when the program kept locking up.
- Asset Management – The training on this module was pretty straight forward.

K. OTHER LESSONS AND COMMENTS

There are some things that we learned that don't quite fall into any of the above categories. Below is a brief summary of each.

- All one needs to access any PeopleSoft Application is a web browser and an authorized login. This is particularly helpful when one is away from the workplace and needs to view a report, approve a voucher, submit a process, etc. It doesn't matter if one is out of the state or at home, except for scheduled downtimes, PeopleSoft is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.
- Multiple go live dates split project resources which compounded the issue of a shortage of staff as a portion of the project team worked on Production issues while other members worked on project. The 90 day post production gap helped but did not solve the overall resource commitment issue.
- Overall Agency ownership and timely responses;
    - If an agency was slow to react, functionality/configuration was impacted. Participation was often spotty. Some agencies attended initial BPA discussions then did not participate after that. Those same agencies often had the largest issues after go live.

Survey Comments:

What were the most significant issues on this project?

- The most significant issues were the payroll lag and the cooperation with Higher Ed. Those issues still remain today.
- Pay cycle issues should have been identified and addressed earlier in the process (at product evaluation time)>Developer staffing levels were too low. A lot of overtime was

done by developers. It may have been cheaper to have had a larger staff from the beginning. I was not impressed with the work of the Maximus technical staff. The knowledge and skill levels were not what they should have been. Maintenance of code developed by them has been more challenging than it should be.

- Decisions around payroll pay periods had a large impact on the project; inadequate support was provided by Maximus for inventory and assets.
- Meeting all agency expectations; meeting the reporting expectations of the agencies; reporting environment vs. production environment. Need to resolve this constraint and potential risk to the system; payroll cycle/schedule (still believe the best solution was to incorporate a lag).
- Politics of Payroll, Time & Labor, State/HIE
- Sharing the same database with two separate entities.
- More resources would have been nice; very aggressive project timeline; number of modules deployed; State/University System. Using the same app.; Timing – it was difficult to coordinate rollouts, upgrades, etc. between the 3 entities. We still see that today.
- I think the main issues were, adequate training for all parties involved and project team members were spread too thin between various modules.
- Having business process change of payroll lag revoked delayed implementation and exceeded budget; Getting HIED cooperation and approval; Commitment control processing problems; slow processing in FIN; Report retention; Getting agencies to change business processes (esp. DOT).
- The most significant issues dealt with coordination between State and HE. At times, staffing/workload were also an issue.
- Working together with Higher Ed; reporting; security; payroll issue (change management).
- Time allowed rolling out the project and limited resources. I think staff was stretched as various stages of the project mainly because staff was trying to rollout PeopleSoft and continue business as usual back in the agency.
- Inventory – No demonstration of how everything SHOULD work together. Failure of the consultant to test cost accounting, as per numerous request of module lead.

What were the lessons learned on this project?

- On the payroll side I would say to have been able to hold more detailed training sessions and to have had more reports in place at go live.
- More time could have been spent on training.
- Get more participation from agencies, especially in the area of reports; I believe the agencies should have written them; change management – probably should have had some additional agency checkpoints/checklists during the project to help ensure buy-in and meeting expectations; more report gathering, design and development of them.
- Needed more resources; provide more user training; better communication with user community; most post Prod support from Maximus; better system documentation for users; under estimated post production support.
- You can never have enough training. Not sure the change management was what we thought it would be with state agencies. I think most people are trying to do their business just the way they did in the past.
- Don’t do it with HIED; have person with on-going “maintenance” duties more involved in implementation (Assets); Follow-up more frequently on agency progress for agency specific areas (DOT).
- More initial orientation/training on the project processes; more staffing in critical areas at critical times.
- You can accomplish great things working as a team.
- Inventory – Don’t go live until everything is working at least marginally.

What on the project worked well and was effective in the delivery of the product?

- On the payroll side our team worked very well together and our means of running the parallel payrolls worked extremely well.
- The implementation project team members were all very talented, hardworking, knowledgeable and good to work with. The team makeup was excellent.
- Having the technical staff attend BP and Fit Sessions was a big help since it gave us a background in the business processes and introduction to the product so we weren't completely lost when we had to begin working on it.
- One-time payments fulfilled a critical need for multiple agencies.
- Strong project team; got it right with few iterations/resolutions required; Can Do Attitude – always positive; setting roles; responsibilities and expectations were clear and followed; issue management (part of team effort).
- Project mgmt – we were on time and on budget if not for the payroll lag decision; Maximus was a great help; Project team meetings.
- Our relationship with Maximus was very good and they were very helpful.
- State team cooperated well – Maximus assistance was great. ITD programmers (esp. Greg, Kevin) were excellent and easy to work with.
- Establishing an off-site project location helped focus efforts; use of agency SME's (more involved agencies have demonstrated more buy-in and commitment to the project).
- Make-up of the State Team; Maximus did a great job; involvement of SME's.
- Communication and working as a team from one module to another.
- Inventory – Some of the problems were big, some were small. Most took very little time to resolve, but the initial consultant lacked experience and knowledge in this area.