



Grant Thornton

Monthly Independent Verification and Validation Assessment Report

Florida Planning, Accounting and Ledger Management (PALM)
Project

March 2016

Date: 4/12/2016

DRAFT 06

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 4 |
| Key Project Indicators | 7 |
| Assessment of Project Risk | 7 |
| Findings Addressed This Assessment Period | 9 |
| Summary Findings and Recommendations | 9 |
| Detailed Assessment | 11 |
| 1. Project Execution - Mandated Criteria | 11 |
| 1.1 Scope Management and Change Control | 11 |
| 1.2 Schedule Management | 12 |
| 1.3 Cost Management | 14 |
| 1.4 Risk Management | 16 |
| 1.5 Issue Management | 18 |
| 2. Project Governance | 20 |
| 2.1 Governance | 20 |
| 2.2 Decision Management | 21 |
| 3 Project Execution – Additional Criteria | 22 |
| 3.1 Performance Management | 22 |
| 3.2 Staffing Management | 24 |
| 3.3 Action Item Management | 27 |
| 4 Procurement and Contracts | 29 |
| 4.1 Procurement and Vendor Management | 29 |
| 5. Quality Management | 32 |
| 5.1 Quality Management | 32 |
| 5.2 Deliverable Management | 33 |
| 5.3 Lessons Learned Management | 34 |
| 6. Communications and Outreach | 35 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 6.1 Communications Management | 35 |
| 6.2 Stakeholder Management..... | 36 |
| 6.3 Content Management | 38 |
| 6.4 Collaboration Management..... | 39 |
| Appendix 1. Project Element Value Assessment and Mapping..... | 41 |
| Value Map Approach | 41 |
| Process Values | 42 |
| Appendix 2. Interviews and Meetings Summary | 43 |
| Appendix 3. Project Documentation Reviewed | 44 |

Executive Summary

Grant Thornton is independently assessing the Florida PALM Project, providing observations and recommendations on the program management processes in place to manage, monitor and control the Florida PALM Project through its current phase, known as Pre-Design, Development and Implementation (Pre-DDI). This report presents the technical, schedule and cost risks identified by the Grant Thornton Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) team for the Pre-DDI phase of the Florida PALM project during the month ending March 31, 2016.

The IV&V team, as an unbiased reviewer, has independently reviewed key project performance indicators and assessed project risk utilizing both mandated criteria defined in the IV&V scope of services as well as Grant Thornton's project assessment framework. Based on this review, the IV&V team assesses the risk status of the Florida PALM Project as "Yellow," indicating the project currently faces a set of challenges, if left unmanaged, negatively impact the project's outcome in terms of schedule, budget or quality.

Overall risk status of Florida PALM project:



During this assessment period the Florida PALM project team completed a collaborative review of a major component of the Software and System Integrator (SSI) Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) and evaluated contract deliverables from the procurement support services vendor. The team also conducted knowledge transfer activities with the business process standardization (BPS) vendor, transitioning BPS-related documentation to state staff.

In February 2016 the project team executed a Project Change Request (PCR 17) to move the anticipated release of the ITN to between November 1, 2016 and January 16, 2017. This will lower project risk and increase the probability of success by allowing more time for the integration of Payroll requirements and revised Budget requirements, allowing more time for the review and feedback from both the procurement and ERP outside counsel, and allow for collaboration with agency and legislative partners. PCR 17 also allows the project to be in compliance with the FY 2016/2017 Proviso which mandates a release no earlier than November 1, 2016. The project also executed PCR 18 to adjust the acceptance date of the Florida PALM project's Data Management Plan (DMP) to allow for the review and feedback from external stakeholders, including the Agency for State Technology (AST), and key data integration partners including DMS (People First and MFMP), the Legislature and Executive Office of the Governor (LAS/PBS).

These changes will have a substantial impact on the project timeline. Over the past five weeks, the Florida PALM Project Management Office (PMO) has been engaged in an effort to reflect these changes in the master project schedule. One goal of this planning effort is to elaborate upon the alterations necessitated by PCR 17 and PCR 18 to the master project schedule, and ensure these are integrated across each of the project tracks. Another goal of this planning effort is to create a new schedule baseline, effectively reestablishing target milestone dates based on circumstances encountered during the course of the Pre-DDI phase. A new schedule baseline will be critical to transparent future analysis and reporting on schedule metrics and performance.

Due to the uncertainty associated with a procurement of the size and complexity being contemplated by Florida PALM, the PMO is adopting a “rolling-wave” planning approach to project management. Rolling wave planning is a top-down approach to project planning designed to address uncertainty. The adoption of this approach is completely appropriate for this phase of the project. There are many factors related to public sector procurement outside of the control of the project that could influence the project schedule. One such example relates to the various entities that will sign-off on the ITN prior to release and are not under the direction of the Florida PALM PMO. While the PMO is making attempts to identify and engage with these entities, their level of engagement and commitment is initially less and tends to increase as the ITN release nears. In our experience the project can expect more detailed and critical feedback as time passes. However, the severity and impact of this feedback can be unpredictable, necessitating a project management approach with the flexibility to adapt.

The IV&V team affirms work is underway regarding schedule planning, and we concur a progressive elaboration of the schedule as well as a new project baseline is required. Progressive elaboration of the project schedule is a required element of rolling-wave planning. In the case of the Florida PALM Pre-DDI project, rolling-wave planning should yield a project schedule providing visibility into the near-term and medium-term activities, while providing awareness of longer term tasks, without being unrealistic or overly vague.

At the same time, establishing a new schedule baseline is critical to the project team’s ability to track progress and measure project performance. It represents a preplanned standard by which progress can be measured over time and communicated to stakeholders. Importantly, the schedule baseline is a required element of Earned Value Management (EVM), the project management technique the Florida PALM team is required to employ for a project of this size and complexity.

During this assessment period, IV&V noted changes in the project schedule made as a result of the February 2016 project changes, but we have not yet observed a new schedule baseline. This presents certain challenges to the PMO and by extension to IV&V in utilizing EVM to assess schedule performance this reporting period. It also presents certain challenges in a more limited context to assessing cost performance. The most significant challenges in this regard have to do with forecasting the amount of time and resources required to complete project activities not yet started or activities partially completed.

Two important EVM measures the project has tracked historically are schedule performance index (SPI) and cost performance index (CPI). SPI measures the efficiency of time utilized on the project. Because proxy values are being used for cost, CPI measures the efficiency of resources. Using proxy values for cost is a commonly encountered practice when faced with fixed-price contracts. For both measures, the key elements analyzed are variances between what was planned versus what was actually

accomplished. Quantifying these variances in time and effort enable the PMO to determine if the project is on schedule or will remain on schedule. Quantifying these variances also allows the project management team to make forecasts based on the remaining amount of time and resources available.

The IV&V team does not believe that the project schedule and current schedule baseline can be used to reliably measure schedule performance utilizing EVM techniques until such time as the project completes the above schedule planning effort.

We would like to make clear, our observation regarding schedule management is made directly in response to changes reflected primarily in PCR 17. A new ITN release schedule has invalidated certain assumptions documented in the prior project schedule. We can confirm the project team is adapting to these changes, however the PMO's reporting on schedule performance and effort is incomplete until the underway schedule planning work is finished.

With the multi-year timeline of Florida PALM, it is not unusual for the project team to have to revisit project planning assumptions. The PMO will have to pivot and adjust to committing to a new timeline for the ITN release and subsequent procurement activity, just as it will have to document new assumptions around the changes implicit in the addition of Payroll and modification of Budget requirements to the project scope.




At the same time, we believe these changes also have a broader impact on the subsequent phases of work related to Florida PALM. A review of the cost schedules included with the original FLAIR Study in 2014 indicate several of the assumptions made years ago with regard to project funding and the duration of the pre-DDI phase are already out of step with the project today. It would be prudent for the project team to consider the impacts pre-DDI changes have on the greater Florida PALM initiative and to document those assumptions, especially if they diverge from the original FLAIR Study, for the benefit of future phases of work.

Key Project Indicators

| Status | Image |
|---|------------------|
| Is the project on schedule? | YES ¹ |
| Is the project expected to remain on schedule? | UNKNOWN |
| Is the project currently within budget as defined in the spend plan? | YES |
| Is the project expected to remain within budget as defined in the spend plan? | YES |
| Were any project changes proposed or approved during this reporting period? | NO |

Assessment of Project Risk

Throughout the assessment, Grant Thornton uses a red-yellow-green indicator to evaluate the current status of each area and metric. The table below contains an explanation of each status indicator:

| Image | Description |
|---|---|
|  | Red. The assessment category or area faces a challenge or set of challenges that threatens the project's outcome in terms of schedule, cost or quality. The project team should take corrective action immediately. |
|  | Yellow. The assessment category or area faces a challenge or set of challenges that could, if left unmanaged, negatively impact the project's outcome in terms of schedule, cost or quality in the future. The project team should prioritize corrective action. |
|  | Green. The assessment category or area is on track without material issues. The project team should consider any recommendations offered by the IV&V team as process improvement opportunities only. |

The IV&V team utilizes the lowest indicator in each sub-category to determine the summary risk rating. A more detailed view of each of the elements that comprise each sub-category can be found in the Detailed Assessment section beginning on page 11 of this assessment report.




¹ Our observation is based on a review of schedule metrics for the current reporting period including key milestones, tasks, deliverables and planned measures. With schedule modifications underway to accommodate PCR 17, EVM metrics were not available for review.

| Project Area | Current indicator | February 2016 | January 2016 |
|---|-------------------|---------------|--------------|
| 1. Project Execution - Mandated Criteria 1.1. Scope management and change control 1.2. Schedule management 1.3. Cost management 1.4. Risk management 1.5. Issue management | Y | Y | Y |
| 2. Project Governance 2.1. Governance 2.2. Decision management | Y | Y | R |
| 3. Project Execution - Additional Criteria 3.1. Performance management 3.2. Staffing management 3.3. Action item management | Y | Y | Y |
| 4. Procurement and Contracts 4.1. Procurement and vendor management | G | G | G |
| 5. Quality Management 5.1. Quality management 5.2. Deliverable management | G | Y | Y |
| 6. Communications and Outreach 6.1. Communications management 6.2. Stakeholder management 6.3. Content management 6.4. Collaboration management | Y | Y | Y |

As part of the IV&V process for assessing and reporting on identified risks, we have applied a value assessment to each area which guides the determination of the priority, or relative impact an individual observation can have on the entire project. A description and explanation of this value assessment approach and the most recent results can be found in Appendix 1 beginning on page 41.







Findings Addressed This Assessment Period

The following table summarizes all findings that have been addressed this assessment period:

| Summary Finding | Current indicator | Area(s) impacted | New Observation |
|---|---|--|--|
| F06. The project team currently relies on high-level process definitions and standards outlined within the PMP to manage project quality instead of following a formalized deliverable lifecycle development and review process. |  | 5.1 – Quality management 5.2 – Deliverable management | The Deliverable Management Standards and Procedures has been developed. As part of the QMS it addresses the full deliverable lifecycle development and review process. |
| F07. The updated Communications Plan adopted in January contains a full stakeholder assessment, but does not include feedback or monitoring processes on the effectiveness of the communications. |  | 6.1 – Communications management | Feedback and monitoring processes were observed for stakeholder workshops. The project team developed a summary report of feedback from the stakeholder participants for the purpose of monitoring stakeholder engagement. |
| F08. The project team currently tracks participation in events but does not have a formal strategy or metrics for measuring the other key elements of change such as awareness and buy-in. |  | 6.2 – Stakeholder management | The project team has outlined a process for capturing relevant communications to and from stakeholders within a project-wide communications log. Measurement of awareness and buy-in is not yet operationalized, but the project team does track key elements of change during events where the project interacts with a convened group of stakeholders at requirements workshops. |

Summary Findings and Recommendations

The following table summarizes any “Red” or “Yellow” findings from the detailed assessment section of the report and maps our associated observations/recommendations to the project health indicator presented in our overall risk reporting:







| Summary Finding | Current indicator | Area(s) impacted | Recommendation |
|--|---|--|---|
| F03. The process for tracking, measuring, and reporting several key project performance metrics such as SPI and CPI has not been formalized. |  | 3.1 – Performance management | Implement the project performance metrics section of the QMS. The project team may consider mapping key project metrics, their location, and the process by which they are being calculated as an interim reference. |
| F04. The lack of a full time OCM manager places increased demands on the project director who is temporarily filling that role. |  | 3.2 – Staffing management | The project team should fill the OCM manager position and continue to follow its staffing plan, or consider alternatives relieving the increased workload from the project director. The project team may want to consider utilizing the services of a contractor as a stop-gap measure if this position remains difficult to fill. |
| F05. The project team tracks open action items and reviews them on a regular basis in the RAIDL meetings and the weekly RADAR report. There are no separate metrics tracked. |  | 3.3 – Action item management | Identify action item health metrics such as percent closed by due date and average aging, and add these to regular (monthly or quarterly) internal project review processes. |
| F09. The OCM team has created and published document management standards and naming conventions. There is ambiguity around how to track versions of deliverables and other maintained project artifacts. |  | 6.3 – Content management | The project should complete the implementation of the QMS, which has a segment identified to address this topic. |
| F10. Each team has their own SharePoint file structure, leading to confusion and difficulty in finding documents across tracks. |  | 6.3 – Content management | The project should consider creating a standardized SharePoint file structure and taxonomy for common elements within each track (e.g. status, work plans, deliverables), while enabling flexibility for track-specific content. |
| F12. Until the revised governance structure is implemented, the project is vulnerable to reversals of previous decisions such as the exclusion of payroll from the ITN (Decision 4, reversed in Decision 87). |  | 1.1 – Scope management and change control 2.2 – Decision management | To avoid future reversals of key decisions made by the project, implement the February 19 updated governance structure. |

Detailed Assessment

1. Project Execution - Mandated Criteria

1.1 Scope Management and Change Control

Key Metrics










| Item | Observed | Current Status | Previous Status | Notes |
|--|----------|---|---|--|
| Number of open change requests | 0 |  |  | No project change requests were noted during this assessment period. |
| Number of change requests processed this period with final determination | 0 |  |  | |
| Number of open change requests in overdue status | 0 |  |  | |

Process Observation Summary

The process for managing changes to the project is defined within the project management plan. Requests for project changes are logged to the project's project change request log. The change request log is available to all project team members and provides visibility into: the specific project team members to review changes, any disposition considerations and a record of approval, including any escalations that were required.





During the current assessment period no project change requests were noted. There were no project change requests in overdue status at the end of the assessment period.

On February 19, the project updated its governance charter to include a multi-tiered governance structure. The revised governance structure includes an executive steering committee composed of stakeholder members have yet to be appointed.

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| Determine a structured process is in place for identifying, documenting, reviewing, and obtaining appropriate approval for any change to project scope. | Until the revised governance structure is implemented, the project is vulnerable to reversals of previous decisions such as the exclusion of payroll from the ITN (Decision 4, reversed in Decision 87). | To avoid future reversals of key decisions made by the project, implement the February 19 updated governance structure. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify pending project changes and decisions are clearly communicated to impacted Stakeholders in the appropriate level of detail. | The project team generates periodic status reports that include pending project and decisions to stakeholders. Relevant project artifacts reviewed during this period include legislative updates and steering committee updates. No project changes were noted in the current assessment period. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify any changes to the project scope adhere to the defined change control processes and the appropriate governance levels for change process. | No changes to project scope were noted during this assessment period. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

1.2 Schedule Management

Key Metrics







| Item | Observed | Current Status | Previous Status | Notes |
|----------------------|----------|---|---|---|
| % Complete | 72% |  |  | Revision of project schedule reviewed was #108 dated 03/31/2016. This was the last revision of the master schedule posted during the assessment period. |
| Number of Late Tasks | 9 |  |  | |




Process Observation Summary

The Florida PALM project management office (PMO) maintains a master schedule incorporating the various project work tracks. In addition to the master schedule, in November of 2015, the PMO created a schedule baseline to allow for the reporting of schedule performance and cost performance as directed by the Agency for State Technology (AST). The PMP establishes the processes by which the master schedule is maintained, the conditions under which the schedule baseline may be changed and the manner in which work packages from each of individual tracks may be added to the project schedule.

The project team has elected to utilize the rolling-wave planning approach to progressively elaborate the schedule as the project unfolds. This in turn places a demand on the PMO to plan iteratively. The PMO is currently drafting schedule management standards and procedures which suggest rolling-wave planning is to be done with a 30-day planning horizon.



Several significant changes to the project have been made since the last schedule baseline. The substance of these changes allow for: (a) more time to include payroll in the business requirements, (b) more time to review the ITN with outside counsel and the steering committee, and (c) more time to complete the data management plan.

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|---|-------------------------|---|
| Identify whether the project is on schedule. If any schedule slippage exists, identify whether project leadership has assessed severity of the slippage, and identified mitigating actions to address. | The master project schedule currently indicates an on-track status. Schedule performance lags slightly but is within an acceptable tolerance. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine if project milestones have been identified and documented. | Project milestones continue to be called out in the master project schedule. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|---|-------------------------|---|
| Determine if a process exists for comparing project progress against planned (baselined) measures. | The project continues to review the Project Schedule against baseline on a regular basis as evidenced by the weekly status reports. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

1.3 Cost Management













Key Metrics




| Item | Observed | Current Status | Previous Status | Notes |
|------------------------------|----------|--|--|---|
| Cost Performance Index (CPI) | 0.89 |  |  | The project is currently tracking CPI in the master project schedule. CPI is slightly outside of the tolerance range of 0.90 to 1.10. |

Process Observation Summary

The project continues to follow their cost management procedures as outlined in the PMP and is continuing to refine the level of detail needed. During this assessment period the project team modified the definition of actual spend to be costs incurred instead of invoices paid. The project team continues to track schedule performance (SPI) and cost performance (CPI) using earned value management (EVM) techniques against the master schedule. Proxy values for project cost are used.









As of March 31, the project schedule indicates a CPI of 0.89, which is slightly outside the established tolerance of 0.90 to 1.10. Because the PMO is utilizing proxy values for cost, this does not indicate nor does it necessarily mean the project is over budget. However, a CPI slightly below the tolerance range does support the conclusion the project has allocated greater resources in terms of people and effort originally anticipated for the tasks in the schedule baselined in November.

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|--|---|---|
| Determine whether the project budget appears sufficient to support the activities associated with the scope of the project. | The project budget for the year appears sufficient based on the spend plan and the list of two-party agreements. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine the project's compliance with the defined cost management techniques in the PMP (cost management plan component). | The project team follows the cost management process outlined in Appendix 2 of the PMP. | The project team may consider elaborating on the spend baseline and spend control descriptions in the cost management section (Appendix 2) of the PMP. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify a project baseline has been established. Assess the projected costs approved and the actual costs of implementing and maintaining the completed project against the baseline. | The project spend plan currently identifies planned expenditures fiscal year to date along with incurred expenditures as well as paid actuals. | The project team should update Appendix 2 of the PMP with the new process being followed as a result of reporting on incurred liabilities instead of cash payments. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify monitoring is being done on progress against project costs and expended effort. | Cost monitoring is being performed in accordance with the description of spend control in Appendix 2 of the PMP. | The project team should consider elaborating on the spend baseline and spend control descriptions in Appendix 2 of the PMP. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|--|---|---|
| Verify the right performance measures are being collected and managed for cost management. | The project spend plan currently identifies planned expenditures fiscal year to date along with incurred expenditures as well as paid actuals. | The project team should update Appendix 2 of the PMP with the new process being followed as a result of reporting on incurred liabilities instead of cash payments. | Current  Previous  Trend  |













1.4 Risk Management







Key Metrics

| Item | Observed | Current Status | Previous Status | Notes |
|--------------------------------------|----------|---|---|---|
| # of risks opened during this period | 4 |  |  | Volume of new risks added to the risk log and risks closed are appropriate for the size and complexity of this project. |
| # of risks closed during this period | 5 |  |  | |
| # of overdue risks | 0 |  |  | There were no risks observed with a due date that occurs in the past. |
| # of risks transitioned into issues | 2 |  |  | Two risks related to project funding transitioned into issues (Issue #12 and Issue #13). Both issues were closed after the funding release on 3/9/2016. |

Process Observation Summary







Risks on the Florida PALM Project continue to be tracked and managed using the MS SharePoint portal following the risk management processes as outlined per the PMP. These risks are reviewed at regular RAIDL meetings. AST continues to attend the project team's bi-weekly RAIDL meeting for observation and to provide feedback when solicited by the project team.

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|---|-------------------------|---|
| Verify a project Risk Management Plan and supporting procedures are in place and complete. | The Risk Management process is defined in Appendix 9 of the PMP. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify the Risk Management plan is being followed and is effectively identifying, tracking, and managing project risk in a standardized fashion. | Risk management meetings are held at least weekly, and evidence of the identification, tracking and managing of project risk occurs in the project team's risk log. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine whether the Executive Sponsorship understands effective risk management planning and execution and are reinforcing the importance of sound risk management in their communications with project personnel. | Results of the risk reporting function of the project team are brought to the attention of the Project Steering Committee at least monthly and discussed as evidenced by meeting agendas and by direct observation. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine whether project team members possess a command of the defined risk management plan and processes. | Risk management processes were followed by each of the Work Tracks as well as by the PMO during the assessment period. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|---|---|---|--|
| Verify that consistent criteria for evaluating and quantifying risk likelihood and severity levels have been defined. | A criteria for evaluating and quantifying likelihood and severity is performed by the risk management team in accordance with the risk analysis process defined in Appendix 8 of the PMP. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify that risks have been prioritized for mitigation. | It was observed that the project team holds regularly scheduled RAIDL meetings to identify and address risks in accordance with Appendix 8 of the PMP. | Continue to adhere to the regular RAIDL review process and monitor and address identified risks in a timely manner and continually improve the process. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

1.5 Issue Management










Key Metrics

| Item | Observed | Current Status | Previous Status | Notes |
|------------------------------------|----------|---|---|---|
| New issues opened this period | 2 |  |  | All previous and new issues opened this assessment period have been closed. |
| Issues closed this period | 7 |  |  | |
| Open Issues past target completion | 0 |  |  | There were no open issues at the end of this period. |

Process Observation Summary

Issues on the Florida PALM Project continue to be tracked and managed using a MS SharePoint portal. The project actively manages project risks and has had very few of these risks become issues. The project issue database is used for issues that have an active impact on the project scope, schedule or execution. AST continues to attend the project's bi-weekly RAIDL meeting for observation and to provide feedback when solicited by the project team.

Release of project funding within occurred on March 9, effectively closing all open issues. Currently there are no open issues logged.










| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|---|--|---|
| Verify guidelines to determine which issues are subject to a formal evaluation process have been established and maintained. | Issue management is formally defined in Appendix 11 of the PMP. Exhibit 11-12 defines the issue escalation levels. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify issues are collected and analyzed, and corrective actions have been created to address them. | Corrective actions included for all issues are captured in the issues log. Issue review occurs on a regularly scheduled basis per the outlined process. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify the existence and institutionalization of an appropriate project issue tracking mechanism that documents issues as they arise, enables communication of issues to proper Stakeholders, documents a mitigation strategy as appropriate, and tracks the issue to closure. | The project utilizes the Microsoft SharePoint issue management log in accordance with the issue management process defined in Appendix 11 of the PMP. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify corrective action has been taken on identified issues. | Corrective actions are taken on identified issues through the weekly and bi-weekly RAIDL process. | The project team may consider moving issue review to a weekly activity as the volume of open issues increases. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

2. Project Governance

2.1 Governance







Process Observation Summary

As part of the current legislative session, additional guidance regarding the governance structure is anticipated. The project team is working to proactively incorporate this feedback into an updated version.

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|---|--|---|
| Evaluate effectiveness of project governance for a project of this size and complexity. | Currently the project has accepted but not yet fully implemented a governance charter that considers both legislative requirements and the needs of the project. The multi-tiered structure described by the governance charter is appropriate for a project of this size and complexity. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Assess executive Stakeholder buy-in, participation, support and commitment, and open pathways of communication exist among all Stakeholders. | Currently the project has accepted but not yet fully implemented a governance charter that considers both legislative requirements and the needs of the project. | As the new project steering committee is convened, the project team should consider actively engaging the new members. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify lines of reporting and responsibility provide adequate technical and managerial oversight of the project. | The current governance charter establishes clear lines of reporting for the project team. Under the current organization structure, oversight defaults to the Executive and Project Sponsors until such time as the Executive Steering Committee can convene. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |







2.2 Decision Management







Key Metrics

| Item | Observed | Current Status | Previous Status | Notes |
|---|----------|---|---|---|
| Number of new decisions added this period | 0 |  |  | There are no new decisions added to the decision log this period. |
| Number of decisions closed this period | 0 |  |  | There were no decisions closed this period. |
| Number of overdue open decisions | 0 |  |  | There are no overdue open decisions. |

Process Observation Summary

The processes associated with decision management are clearly defined in terms of required information, approvals, and escalations. The decision log is reviewed regularly and contains a sufficient level of detail appropriate for a project of this size and complexity. An accounting is included for each closed decision in accordance with the PMP.

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|---|--|---|---|
| Verify Stakeholders have bought in to all changes which impact project objectives, scope, cost, or schedule. | Until the revised governance structure is implemented, the project is vulnerable to reversals of previous decisions such as the exclusion of payroll from the ITN (Decision 4, reversed in Decision 87). | To avoid future reversals of key decisions made by the project, implement the February 19 updated governance structure. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify that the project team and project sponsors have reviewed and approved any project changes impacting general scope or direction to help ensure alignment with the project objectives. | As defined in the current project charter, the project steering committee and project sponsors review project decisions identified for steering committee and CFO review as they are made and presented as evidenced by documented decisions and changes to the project made during the assessment period. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|--|-------------------------|--|
| Determine whether the project and project sponsors have reviewed and approved any deviations from the project baseline budget prior to further action (e.g., contract modification). | As defined in the current project charter, the project steering committee and project sponsors reviewed project decisions identified for steering committee and CFO review as they are made and presented as evidenced by documented decisions and changes to the project made during the assessment period. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine whether the baseline (and any re-baselines) to the master project schedule was vetted through and received approval from project sponsors. | The current baseline for the master schedule was approved by the project steering committee. During the previous assessment period, other schedule changes were authorized for which a new baseline is expected to be vetted. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

3 Project Execution – Additional Criteria

3.1 Performance Management










Process Observation Summary




The project team has defined 29 distinct project performance measures within the PMP. These project performance measures are intended to provide insight into eight different project management areas: cost management, schedule management, risk management, issue management, scope management, quality management, organizational change management and staffing management.

The project has chosen to adopt and implement these performance measures at varying times along the project life cycle in order to coincide with the implementation of data gathering and reporting project management tools. Currently the project is working with the IV&V vendor to develop an implementation plan for the Quality Management System (QMS), which will include refinements to the performance metrics and implementation of project support tools to enable easier collection and reporting of project performance. The implementation of additional metrics is expected to last into May 2016.

Underlying data for the defined risk, issue and scope measures are available through the project's RAIDL dashboards and are available in real time. The various logs available under the RAIDL dashboards offer a comprehensive view of the risks, actions, issues, decisions and lessons learned. Combined with the IV&V team's direct observations of these logs being maintained regularly, we express confidence in the measures generated from this data, even though the project team currently does not report them.





Performance metrics related to the project team’s use of earned value management (EVM) techniques continue to be an area where the project team should formalize its approach. Currently the project measures schedule performance (SPI) and cost performance (CPI) only on a subset of project tasks. The PMO is currently drafting schedule management standards and procedures which suggest that SPI/CPI should be operationalized and that schedule baseline commitments should occur in 30-day intervals. However, this was not observed during the assessment period. The IV&V team does, however, note there is a significant amount of work underway both to operationalize project performance management as well as to operationalize the rolling-wave planning and schedule baseline processes. Until this work is completed though, the project team will experience difficulty in producing project artifacts such as a milestone road map or a track deliverable status, reducing project visibility.

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|---|---|---|
| Evaluate implementation of the performance management activities and metrics to determine if processes are effective and are being followed. | The process for tracking, measuring, and reporting several key project performance metrics such as SPI and CPI has not been formalized. | Implement the project performance metrics section of the QMS. The project team may consider mapping key project metrics, their location, and the process by which they are being calculated as an interim reference. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Evaluate if appropriate mechanisms are in place for project self-evaluation and process improvement. | Lessons learned are captured after each task and tracked in SharePoint in the lessons learned log. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify selected measurements are being obtained and analyzed to manage the project and support organization needs. | Key project metrics are being measured and reported individually. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|--|-------------------------|---|
| Verify project's performance is periodically reviewed and aligned with current and anticipated needs, objectives, and requirements of the organization, customers, and end users as appropriate. | Project performance is reviewed during the regular internal status meetings. Additionally, project performance is reported externally on a weekly and monthly basis. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

3.2 Staffing Management

Key Metrics

| Item | Observed | Current Status | Previous Status | Notes |
|--|-------------------|---|---|---|
| Percent of scheduled positions filled. | 95% (18 of 19) |  |  | The Project has not filled the OCM lead position. Prior to March 22, this information was tracked in the project schedule with a January 2016 projected completion date. As of the end of the assessment period, the projected completion date has been moved to November 2016. |
| Turnover | 5.3% (1 of 19) |  |  | One project team member has left the project in the past six months. The individual who left went to a position in DFS where they will continue to support the project. The position has been filled with a resource from DFS who was previously supporting the project. |










Process Observation Summary











The PMO manages a formal staffing and onboarding process for state staff and the Contract Managers manage the process for their assigned Contractors. Onboarding procedures and support materials have been developed and are shared with new members of the team to provide a clear and consistent background on the project and operating guidelines moving forward.




The project team looks for the best possible candidate for each position, from both a skillset and personality fit. This has led to longer lead times to fill some positions, but has resulted in a stronger, more capable project team. Remaining project positions are forecast to be filled later in the year with dependencies on the ITN release and evaluation dates.

The PMO is in the process of establishing a new baseline project schedule which would incorporate the project changes made in February 2016 extending the release date of the ITN among other milestones. Previously, the project team had reported a projected hire

date of January 2016 for the vacant OCM manager position. Sometime after March 21 that date had been moved back in the existing project schedule to November 2016. Nonetheless, the IV&V team believes that – regardless of the new November deadline – the lack of a full time OCM manager places increased workload demands on the Project Director who is temporarily filling that role. The project team should consider filling the role with either a full-time employee or utilizing a contractor as a stop-gap measure should the role remain difficult to fill with a state employee.





| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|---|--|-------------------------|---|
| Verify project roles and associated responsibilities are clearly defined, documented, and communicated and verify that each project team member is mapped to a distinct project role. | The current project charter establishes clear lines of reporting for the project team. Under the current organization structure, oversight defaults to the executive sponsor and project sponsors. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine whether the design and structure of the project management team is sufficient to support the project given the project's size, scope and complexity. | The structure and staffing of the PMO team continues to be appropriate for the Pre-DDI effort. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine whether the design of the organizational structure reflects clear lines of reporting, responsibility and accountability. | The project's organization structure is clear and the team members understand their reporting relationships and how they support each other. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|---|---|--------------------------------|--|
| <p>Determine whether the project operates in accordance with the organizational structure, wherein the defined/documented lines of reporting, responsibility and accountability are practiced/adhered to by project team members.</p> | <p>The project team continues to follow the project structure with each track lead managing their team.</p> | <p>No new recommendations.</p> | <p>Current  Previous  Trend </p> |
| <p>Determine whether project resources appear appropriately qualified to perform their assigned duties (based on the defined project roles/responsibilities).</p> | <p>The current project resources appear to have the background experience and knowledge required for their positions.</p> | <p>No new recommendations.</p> | <p>Current  Previous  Trend </p> |
| <p>Determine the project's compliance with the resource management techniques defined in the PMP.</p> | <p>The project team follows the staffing planning and onboarding processes outlined within the PMP.</p> | <p>No new recommendations.</p> | <p>Current  Previous  Trend </p> |
| <p>Evaluate the stability of the project team and cross sharing of knowledge to buffer for vacations and possible turnover.</p> | <p>The project team actively manages staffing and cross-sharing of information within each work track where possible.</p> | <p>No new recommendations.</p> | <p>Current  Previous  Trend </p> |

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|--|---|---|
| Determine if adequate time and resources are assigned to each project phase to gauge whether the project is sufficiently "resourced" (time, money and staffing) for future work. | The lack of a full time OCM manager places increased demands on the Project Director who is temporarily filling that role. | The project team should fill the OCM manager position and continue to follow its staffing plan, or consider alternatives relieving the increased workload from the project director. The project team may want to consider utilizing the services of a contractor as a stop-gap measure if this position remains difficult to fill. | Current  Previous  Trend  |




3.3 Action Item Management










Key Metrics

| Item | Observed | Current Status | Previous Status | Notes |
|-------------------------------|----------|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| Action items past due | 0 |  |  | There are no past due action items. |
| Average age of past due items | 0 days |  |  | |

Process Observation Summary

The project has a strong discipline around identifying, assigning, tracking, and following up on action items. Each open action item is reviewed at each track's regular (weekly or bi-weekly) RAIDL meeting. The project team reviews all of the open action items bi-weekly to validate their status.







| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|---|--|-------------------------|---|
| Verify action items are clearly defined and differentiated from project tasks, issues, and risks. | Action items are defined in the PMP and are distinct from project tasks, issues and risks. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|---|---|--|---|
| Verify Action Items are managed in a consistent manner across the project and are at an appropriate level of detail. | Action items recorded during the assessment period are consistent in level of detail. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify open Action Items are regularly reviewed to ensure they are being managed, and if there is a change or larger impact, they are transferred to the master project schedule where appropriate. | The project team reviews action items at least bi-weekly at regularly scheduled RAIDL meetings. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify metrics are in place and reviewed on a regular basis regarding the status and closure of Action Items. | The project team tracks open action items and reviews them on a regular basis in the RAIDL meetings and the weekly RADAR report. There are no separate metrics tracked. | Identify action item health metrics such as percent closed by due date and average aging, and add these to regular (monthly or quarterly) internal project review processes. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

4 Procurement and Contracts

4.1 Procurement and Vendor Management







Key Metrics













| Item | Observed | Current Status | Previous Status | Notes |
|---------------------------------|----------|---|---|---|
| % Contracts on Schedule. | 100% |  |  | Current contracts are on schedule for deliverable or hourly service delivery. |
| % Contracts on Budget. | 100% |  |  | Current contracts are within planned budget. |
| Contract Execution on Schedule. | Yes |  |  | Current planned procurements are on schedule. |










Process Observation Summary

Procurements and Vendor contracts are managed through the PMO. The project has two designated procurement professionals who manage the procurements from the initial strategy, to contract execution and through contract closeout. There have been no significant changes to the procurement processes during the reporting period.

During this assessment period the project executed a contract for SDS support services.

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|---|-------------------------|---|
| Determine if procurement has explicitly mapped the procurement objectives and strategy to the program objectives, and if such mapping accurately reflects the procurement strategy being followed. | The PMO manages procurements following the process outlined in the PMP and executes each work track's procurement strategy as outlined. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine if solicitation documentation clearly articulates measurable project objectives, and clearly identifies what (if any), project objectives are the responsibility of the Contractor. | Solicitation documentation reviewed for a selection of procurements from the Florida PALM procurement log contain clear descriptions of contractor responsibilities and project objectives. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|---|--|-------------------------|---|
| Determine if the solicitation documentation provides adequate detail on the project functional requirements, and if the solicitation process offers bidders, an adequate opportunity for dialogue on functional requirements so that questions, ambiguities and misunderstandings can be rectified prior to contract award. | The plans for the ITN include time for questions and dialog to enable bidders to gain an understanding of the project functional requirements. No other procurements were worked during the assessment period. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine whether key project risks have been shared with potential Contractors. Determine whether significant drivers of risk (e.g., organization and business process change, limitations in number and skills of agency resources, number and complexity of legacy systems to be replaced, etc.) to the potential Contractors have been explained in such a way that bidders can address and mitigate them in their bid. | The plans for the ITN include time for questions and dialog to enable bidders to gain an understanding of the project functional requirements. No other procurements were worked during the assessment period. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine whether documented evaluation processes exist and are being consistently followed. | The BPS and procurement teams are currently planning the evaluation process for the ITN. No other procurements were worked during the reporting period. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine whether the Evaluation Team has received training and ongoing guidance necessary for them to evaluate bids in an effective and consistent manner. | No procurements were worked during the reporting period. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |










| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|---|---|-------------------------|---|
| Determine if matters that pose a risk to project scope are promptly escalated to the appropriate parties, including Contracts. | As critical decisions and scope items for the ITN are raised, they have been documented and managed either as project changes or as project decisions. No other procurements were worked during the reporting period. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine if invoice review processes are established. | The project is following the DFS Contract Lifecycle Guide and the guidelines published by the DFS Division of Accounting & Auditing for invoice review | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine if the defined quality assurance and deliverable approval processes are being followed in the review and acceptance of all contract deliverables. | Deliverable review and approval processes are being followed for all contract deliverables. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Evaluate Contractor change request and defect tracking processes. | There were no change requests during this assessment period from contractors or contractor work which resulted in a project change request. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |










5. Quality Management

5.1 Quality Management

Process Observation Summary



A high-level approach to quality management is outlined within the PMP. The project team has finalized the QMS implementation strategy and has begun work on the QMS implementation plan. During this assessment period the project team updated the QMS implementation plan and released draft definitions documents for each section of the QMS.

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|---|--|---|
| Verify project self-evaluations are performed and that measures are continually taken to improve the process. | Project self-evaluation was not scheduled to be performed during this assessment period. | The project team should consider conducting a self-evaluation post release of the ITN. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify QA has an appropriate level of independence. | QA is monitored by the QA/Risk Manager. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify all process definitions and standards are complete, clear, up-to date, consistent in format, and easily available to project personnel. | The QMS Implementation Strategy has been finalized. Until the QMS is released, the project team follows high-level process definitions and standards outlined within the PMP. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|---|--|-------------------------|---|
| Assess whether the roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and responsible personnel are identified related to quality assurance and deliverable approval processes. | Deliverable review responsibilities are clearly defined and communicated to appropriate project team members and reflected in the appropriate DED documents. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify QA organization monitors the fidelity of defined processes in all phases of the project. | The Deliverable Management Standards and Procedures has been developed. As part of the QMS it addresses the full deliverable lifecycle development and review process. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify quality of products produced by the project is monitored by formal reviews and sign-offs where appropriate. | Project deliverables are reviewed and formally signed off. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |







5.2 Deliverable Management

Key Metrics

| Item | Observed | Current Status | Previous Status | Notes |
|--|----------|---|---|--|
| Milestone slippage and/or schedule changes due to deliverable development or review. | 0 |  |  | No project change requests were added or approved during this assessment period. |

Process Observation Summary

The project follows a structured deliverable review process. Key elements of that process include the development and review steps for each deliverable are included in the master project schedule and a deliverable expectations document (DED) is created for each, defining the scope, content, and review process for the deliverable. A review committee of project team staff and project sponsors is identified and assigned to each deliverable. Upon completion of the review and edit process the committee makes a recommendation for approval to the project director, who approves each deliverable.










| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|--|-------------------------|---|
| Ensure there is a clear definition of project deliverables and that deliverables are managed in a consistent manner. | The deliverable process outlined in the PMP is now being followed for internal deliverables. One recent example of the process was the updated of the project's communications plan. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify defined deliverable review process is consistently administered across the project. | The deliverable process outlined in the PMP is now being followed for internal deliverables. One recent example of the process was the updated of the project's communications plan. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

5.3 Lessons Learned Management

Process Observation Summary

'Lessons Learned' are defined in the PMP as any useful information or experience gained through the course of the project that can be applied to a later phase or project activity.

The project has a sound discipline around identifying and documenting findings. Significant lessons are entered into the project SharePoint portal. New or active lessons learned are reviewed at each track's regular RAIDL meeting. At the bi-weekly PMO RAIDL meeting, any new lessons learned items are reviewed.

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|--|-------------------------|---|
| Verify lessons learned, which could improve processes have been identified. | Lessons learned are documented in SharePoint by the tracks as they are identified and discussed at the regular RAIDL meetings. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify lessons learned are managed in a consistent manner across the project and are at an appropriate level of detail. | A standard SharePoint tool is used to track the lessons learned. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify project or phase closeout reports are created to provide a concise evaluation of the project. The closeout report should summarize at a high level, the project objectives, variances or deviations from the plan/baseline encountered, lessons learned and next steps. | No project phases were closed during the reporting period. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |







6. Communications and Outreach

6.1 Communications Management

Process Observation Summary

The project team maintains a communications plan to guide the development, execution and monitoring of project communications. The plan defines the communications infrastructure, identifies stakeholder groups and outlines the various types of communications routinely utilized by the project team.













The OCM team maintains a project communications log which serves as a record of all project communications and meetings conducted with entities outside of the Florida PALM project team. Project communications are initially captured within individual project track status reports and later transferred by the OCM team into the communications log.




| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|--|-------------------------|---|
| Determine whether the project communications plan identifies the correct audiences, contains approaches and strategies to maximize receipt of the targeted messages, and contains effective feedback mechanisms. | Feedback and monitoring processes were observed for stakeholder workshops. The project team developed a summary report of feedback from the stakeholder participants for the purpose of monitoring stakeholder engagement. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine if the plan is being successfully executed, observing the plans 'in action'. | The current project communications plan outlines key communication and outreach activities. During the current assessment period, project artifacts were developed consistent with the communication plan and were available for review by the IV&V team. The OCM team also maintains a communication log that substantiates project communication consistent with the communication plan. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

6.2 Stakeholder Management

Process Observation Summary

The project proactively manages outreach to department and agency stakeholders through various formats, including: website updates, directed communications about the project, and planning and execution of a number of workshop and workgroup meetings. The project communications management plan includes a full stakeholder analysis. The OCM team tracks participation and monitors engagement in these sessions to identify and proactively engage agencies that may require additional support. Formal outreach to external parties is being managed, as needed.

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|---|--|---|---|
| Determine if a stakeholder assessment has been performed for the project, and assess the completeness and appropriateness of the targeted audiences and messages. | The project includes a stakeholder assessment as part of the updated communications plan. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Determine whether the change management plan contains approaches and strategies to maximize adoption, assess and manage resistance, assess and increase awareness and effect a successful project implementation. | The project team has adopted an updated communications plan. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Verify that outreach efforts exist to ensure that all Stakeholders are aware of the impending change and know their role in the change process. Verify that communication provides appropriate channels for feedback. | The project team performs proactive communication to impacted stakeholders and uses feedback mechanisms such as surveys and email to gauge the effectiveness of project messages. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Review plan to determine how the team plans to measure the key components of change (e.g., awareness, buy-in, etc.). | The project team has outlined a process for capturing relevant communications to and from stakeholders within a project-wide communications log. Measurement of awareness and buy-in is not yet operationalized, but the project team does track key elements of change during events where the project interacts with a convened group of stakeholders at requirements workshops. | The project team may wish to consider operationalizing the tracking of key elements of change in a manner similar to the efforts during the requirements workshops. | Current  Previous  Trend  |







| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|--|-------------------------|---|
| Determine whether the project proactively identifies areas at risk for resistance and effects strategies to manage the potential resistance. | The project team continues to document risk and issue information on SharePoint and communicate with the impacted parties. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |




6.3 Content Management

Key Metrics

Process Observation Summary

The project extensively uses a Microsoft SharePoint collaboration site for the tracking and managing of working documents and artifacts. Version control is enabled in SharePoint, providing the ability to track revisions to documents if necessary. The project team consistently uses SharePoint collaboration for the internal development of project deliverables and other project artifacts.




| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|--|--|---|
| Verify the project has a clear strategy for maintaining and managing project artifacts. | The project has a strategy which guides the management of project artifacts including work products, deliverables, and KPIs. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |
| Assess the level of detail and adherence to document and deliverable management policies and procedures. | The OCM team has created and published document management standards and naming conventions. There is ambiguity around how to track versions of deliverables and other maintained project artifacts. | The project should complete the rollout and training on standard document version tracking and management. This may be accomplished by the planned QMS rollouts for Document Quality and Release Management. | Current  Previous  Trend  |




| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|---|---|--|---|
| Assess the consistency and ease of finding and accessing project documentation. | Each team has their own SharePoint file structure, leading to confusion and difficulty in finding documents across tracks. The OCM team has begun to develop a consistent file structure and guideline for the project's content. | The project should consider creating a standardized SharePoint file structure and taxonomy for common elements within each track (e.g. status, work plans, deliverables), while enabling flexibility for track-specific content. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

6.4 Collaboration Management

Process Observation Summary

The Florida PALM Project has identified external partners with whom they will require collaboration to be successful. Outreach to a number of these entities has already occurred either through individual project activities or through execution of the communications plan. A formal collaboration strategy for FY15/16 was updated in March and is being followed. This strategy addresses planned engagement with key external stakeholders including state departments, agencies, the FFMS entities, other public sector ERP Implementations and external interest groups.

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|--|--|-------------------------|---|
| Determine whether the Collaboration Management Strategy and Plan contains approaches and strategies to engage with the right external entities to support the goals of the project in a productive manner. | The project team's overall collaboration strategy defines approaches to collaboration with both external State of Florida agency entities as well as entities other than State of Florida agencies. The project team further defines an engagement approach for engaging the statutorily defined functional owners for each of the Florida Financial Management Information System (FFMIS) subsystems. | No new recommendations. | Current  Previous  Trend  |

| Assessment Category | Findings and Observations | Recommendations | Status |
|---|---|--------------------------------|--|
| <p>Verify metrics for assessing collaboration partner engagement are appropriate and tracked.</p> | <p>As part of its collaboration strategy rollout, the project team established partner collaboration metrics such as participation and level of engagement and is evaluating them on a quarterly basis.</p> | <p>No new recommendations.</p> | <p>Current  Previous  Trend </p> |

Appendix 1. Project Element Value Assessment and Mapping

Value Map Approach

Grant Thornton evaluated the elements of project management outlined within the Florida PALM PMP along with additional critical elements included from our methodology. Because risks and issues in some project categories will have a larger impact on the overall project, we prioritized the project elements based on their relative impact to the project. We evaluated each project management process against the following three categories to determine an overall priority for the Pre-SSI portion of the Florida PALM Project. These priorities are likely to change to some degree once the integrator is chosen. Each Project Management process was weighted either 'high', 'medium', or 'low' for each of the following categories, with the average providing the overall prioritization.

- **Correlation to Outcomes** – how directly related is the project area to desired outcomes of the Project. (e.g. scope management has a high correlation; if desired functionality is removed from scope, it will have a significant impact) Note that this category is weighted twice as strongly in the overall prioritization.
- **Visibility** – how much external attention is this project management area likely to attract
- **External Impact** – is this an area that has direct impact on external stakeholders, or where external stakeholders will have a direct impact on the execution of the project

Process Values

The following table displays the project management processes, their relative score in each of the value prioritization categories, and the overall priority value. Going forward, these priority values will be used to weight and prioritize the recommendations identified in the body of this report.

| Project Management Process | Value Prioritization Category | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| | Correlation to Outcomes | Visibility | External Impact | Overall Prioritization |
| 1. Mandated Criteria | | | | |
| 1.1. Scope Management and Change Control | HIGH | HIGH | HIGH | HIGH |
| 1.2. Schedule Management | HIGH | HIGH | MEDIUM | MEDIUM |
| 1.3. Cost Management | HIGH | HIGH | MEDIUM | HIGH |
| 1.4. Risk Management | HIGH | MEDIUM | HIGH | HIGH |
| 1.5. Issue Management | HIGH | MEDIUM | LOW | MEDIUM |
| 2. Governance | | | | |
| 2.1. Project Governance | HIGH | MEDIUM | MEDIUM | HIGH |
| 2.2. Decision Management | HIGH | HIGH | HIGH | HIGH |
| 3. Project Execution | | | | |
| 3.1. Performance Management | HIGH | MEDIUM | LOW | MEDIUM |
| 3.2. Staffing Management | MEDIUM | MEDIUM | LOW | MEDIUM |
| 3.3. Action Item Management | MEDIUM | MEDIUM | LOW | MEDIUM |
| 4. Procurement and Contracts | | | | |
| 4.1. Procurement and Vendor Management | MEDIUM | MEDIUM | HIGH | MEDIUM |
| 5. Quality Management | | | | |
| 5.1. Quality Management | MEDIUM | HIGH | LOW | MEDIUM |
| 5.2. Deliverable Management | HIGH | MEDIUM | LOW | MEDIUM |
| 5.3. Lessons Learned Management | LOW | LOW | LOW | LOW |
| 6. Communications and Outreach | | | | |
| 6.1. Communications Management | LOW | HIGH | HIGH | HIGH |
| 6.2. Stakeholder Management | HIGH | HIGH | HIGH | HIGH |
| 6.3. Content Management | LOW | LOW | LOW | LOW |
| 6.4. Collaboration Management | MEDIUM | LOW | LOW | MEDIUM |

Appendix 2. Interviews and Meetings Summary

The following meetings and interviews were conducted with entities outside of the Florida PALM team during the assessment period covered by this report.

| Meeting Type | Meeting Summary | Agencies Represented |
|--------------------|--|----------------------|
| Planning / working | Project status weekly reviews | AST |
| Status | Steering Committee Meeting with legislature and project sponsors | Florida Legislature |

Appendix 3. Project Documentation Reviewed

The table below lists some of the project artifacts reviewed by the IV&V team in preparation of this assessment:

| Category of Documents Reviewed | Documents Reviewed |
|---|--|
| PMO and project reporting related documents | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Florida PALM Project Charter, 11/20/15 • Florida PALM Project Management Plan, 02/19/16 • Organization Charts, 02/02/16 • SSI Project Management Requirements/Project Specifications (PMO7), • IV&V Continuous Improvement Plan, 03/31/16 • Master Project Schedule, 03/31/16 • Monthly Project Status Reports (PMO6), 03/31/16 • Project Status Reports, 03/25/16 • RADAR Report, 03/31/16 • RAIDL: Action Item Log, 03/31/16 • RAIDL: Decision Log, 03/31/16 • RAIDL: Issues Log, 03/31/16 • RAIDL: Lessons Learned Log, 03/31/16 • RAIDL: Project Change Request Log, 03/31/16 • RAIDL: Risk Log, 03/31/16 • Schedule Planning Notes, 04/01/16 • Spend Plan, 02/29/16 • Track Project Status Reports (PMO5), 03/31/16 • MFMP Two Party Agreements, 09/09/15 • SSI Procurement ITN Documents Part 2 (ITN Bundle 2 – Standard Response Instructions) (PROC13), 11/16/15 • SSI Procurement Strategy (PROC2), 12/03/15 • Procurement Log, 03/31/16 • QMS Glossary Definitions, 03/28/16 • QMS Implementation Plan, 02/22/16 • QMS Implementation Plan Steps, 02/11/16 |

| Category of Documents Reviewed | Documents Reviewed |
|--|---|
| Executive Steering Committee (ESC) related documents | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance Charter, 02/19/16 • Executive Steering Committee Meeting Materials, 03/30/16 |
| Business Process Standardization (BPS) related documents | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BPS Weekly Status Reports, 03/31/16 • BPS Complete Transition of All Documentation, Software, and Training, 03/31/16 • BPS Training Manual and Conduct Training for State Staff on Business Requirements Database and Evaluation Matrix Tool/Template, 03/16/16 • BPS Business Requirements Cycle 2, 03/07/16 • BPS Evaluation of Requirements Traceability Matrix Tools, 01/19/16 • BPS Strategic Plan Sections 1 and 2, 12/28/15 • BPS Business Requirements Evaluation Matrix Tool/Template, 12/17/15 • BPS Level 2 Standardized Business Process Models - Version 1.0, 12/02/15 • BPS Strategic Plan Section 4, 11/25/15 • BPS Business Requirements Cycle 1 , 10/13/15 • BPS Draft Standardization L2 Process Flows, 10/07/15 • BPS Policy Issue Tracking Log, 09/19/15 • BPS Strategic Plan Section 3, 08/06/15 • BPS Standard Business Process L1 Flows and Standard Business Process Model, 07/09/15 • BPS Business Requirements Database Template, 05/27/15 • BPS Track Schedule, 05/18/15 • BPS Standard Business Process Model Template, 05/13/15 • BPS Standard Business Process Model Workflow Template, 05/12/15 |
| Organizational Change Management (OCM) related documents | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Florida PALM Pre-DDI Website (intranet), 03/31/16 • Florida PALM Website (public-facing), 03/31/16 • Communications Log, 03/31/16 • Communications Status Report (I-OCM12A), 03/31/16 • Style Guide, 03/22/16 • Collaboration Strategy FY 2014-2015, 03/17/16 • Collaboration Strategy FY 2015-2016, 03/17/16 • Collaboration Strategy FY16 Q2 Update, 03/17/16 • Level 2 Workgroup Summary Report, 01/28/16 • Level 2 Process Evaluation Questionnaire Summary Report, 01/28/16 • Level 2 Workshop Summary Report, 01/28/16 • L2 Survey Data Preview, 01/28/16 • Communications Plan, 01/21/16 • OCM SharePoint File Structure, 01/20/16 • Florida PALM Collaborative Partners, 11/16/15 • Collaboration Strategy Document Update Guidance Final, 10/27/15 • New Employee Orientation Materials, 07/17/15 • OCM Pre-DDI Track Strategy, 06/15/15 • FFMIS Engagement Strategy, 06/13/15 |
| Procurement related documents | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSI Weekly Status Reports, 03/31/16 • SSI Procurement ITN Documents Part 2, 03/31/16 • Procurement Log, 03/31/16 • SSI Procurement Strategy (PROC2), 12/03/15 • SSI Procurement ITN Documents Part 2 (ITN Bundle 2 - Standard Response Instructions) (PROC13), 11/16/15 |

| Category of Documents Reviewed | Documents Reviewed |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSI Procurement ITN Documents Part 1, 09/29/15 • MFMP Two Party Agreements, 09/09/15 • SSI Procurement Support Schedule, 06/08/15 • BPS Procurement Strategy, 08/26/14 |
| FLAIR Study | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FLAIR Study Report, 4/9/2014 • FLAIR Study Cost Model, 4/9/2014 • Agency Business System Inventory Analysis, 4/8/2014 • Inventory of Agency Systems Interfacing with FLAIR, 4/9/2014 |