

DAVID Y. IGE
GOVERNOR



DEPT. COMM. NO. 17
DOUGLAS MURDOCK
CHIEF INFORMATION
OFFICER

OFFICE OF ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

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

October 21, 2019

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

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

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

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


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

Sincerely,


Douglas Murdock (Oct 21, 2019)

Douglas Murdock
Chief Information Officer
State of Hawai'i

Attachment (2)



Hawaii Department of Human Services Systems Modernization Project

Final IV&V Status Report
for Reporting Period: September 1 - 30, 2019

Final submitted: October 15, 2019

Overview

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



Executive Summary

Executive Summary



In the September reporting period, little movement was observed in relation to most of the risks and issues that IV&V is tracking. The BES project is in a holding pattern pending a decision on the solution architecture (i.e., Adobe portal and Siebel). To date, IV&V has not been informed of any solution architecture decisions. While discussions are ongoing, formal communications to the project have not occurred. In the interim, the ASI has extended JAD and Workgroup efforts, and has stopped work on most of the Technical Design Document (TDD) deliverables; together, this has resulted in a schedule slippage of 3 weeks. The ASI is still determining the potential impact. While DHS and the ASI continue to discuss the “big picture” of the solution, DHS has yet to receive a sufficient holistic functional view of the solution and how solution components fit together.

The ASI pushed the MDM portion of the October release into late November, and as of the end of September, many standard release management practices were not in play. IV&V is concerned about the sequencing of some of the design, test, and RTM related deliverables associated with the release, and whether they include the latest DHS feedback and changes to design.

Although weekly schedule review meetings have been positive in terms of enhancing project communication and increasing transparency - little progress was observed in terms of addressing IV&V's schedule risks around the lack of details and resource loading. IV&V does note that improvement was seen regarding unnamed resource overallocation in the schedule. During the September reporting period, IV&V opened one new risk, one new preliminary concern, and escalated three risks to issues, while closing out one issue.

Executive Summary (cont.)



Jul	Aug	Sep	Category	IV&V Observations
M	M	H	Project Management	<p>IV&V observed little movement in the project management process area during September. Discussions continue at the project leadership level regarding potential changes to the solution architecture including the Adobe portal and Siebel. IV&V has received no substantive information specific to these discussions, and to IV&V's knowledge, no firm decision has been communicated to the project on this topic.</p> <p>IV&V is concerned about the two significant schedule delays announced by the ASI during this reporting period – first, the KOLEA MDM implementation planned for October has been delayed to late November – and second, the UAT start date for the BES implementation has been pushed out 3 weeks. Details regarding these delays are still being analyzed. The project's ability to recover some of the lost time is unknown.</p> <p>Specific to the project schedule, IV&V observed little change regarding the schedule details and resource loading, however resource overallocation has improved. As a result of the lack of overall movement regarding outstanding IV&V risks and issues observed in September, IV&V is escalating the risk rating of the Project Management category to High.</p>


Executive Summary (cont.)



Jul	Aug	Sep	Category	IV&V Observations
M	M	M	Configuration and Development	<p>Despite delivering some functional "big picture" documentation in August and having follow up discussions in September, IV&V still does not have a clear understanding of the holistic view of the solution or how the solution's various functional components will tie together.</p> <p>IV&V is concerned regarding the order in which some design and design-related deliverables have been produced and circulated for approval due to the inter-relatedness and/or dependencies between the documentation. Specifically, design documents (BI-10, BI-11, and BI-14) were modified after Test and RTM documents (BI-20 and BI-21) were released, which could potentially impact the content of both BI-20 and BI-21.</p> <p>Further, while DHS has firmly stated that the project will move forward with Adobe portal, ASI has not yet submitted the latest updated iteration of the change request proposing how they will develop the portal.</p> <p>During this reporting period, the proposed scope and budget of the Contract Amendment for provisioning five cloud DDI environments was approved by the ETS PAC, and the contract has been submitted to the federal partners for approval. As a result, IV&V closed one finding in this category.</p>
N/A	M	M	System Design	<p>IV&V continues to rate the System Design category as a Medium risk for September. IV&V continues to monitor the management of cross-JAD action items and is happy to report that we did not observe nor hear about any missed items during September. As this process is critical to ensuring a complete and integrated design, IV&V will continue to monitor this process to verify that the process is working as designed.</p> <p>In August, IV&V opened a risk specific to JAD sequencing and how workflow/task items and functionality were being designed. During this period, IV&V did not note any changes to the sequencing of JADs, nor how workflow will be accounted for and incorporated into each functional area. The ASI has indicated they will discuss any need for changes with DHS.</p> <p>The ASI communicated to the project in August that deliverable BI-12 System Architecture was on hold with the exception of MDM details for the November release. In September the ASI communicated that it had stopped work on most Technical Design Documents (TDDs), with the same exception for MDM. This has added to IV&V's concern regarding how the ASI will arrive at a holistic solution design and produce and communicate their "big picture" view.</p>

Executive Summary (cont.)



Jul	Aug	Sep	Category	IV&V Observations
N/A	N/A		Deployment	IV&V has opened a new risk in the Deployment category, which has a Medium risk rating. In September, it was communicated that the MDM functionality planned for the October release would be delayed until the end of November. When the delay was announced, the ASI did not have an assigned Release Manager or a defined Release Plan. The sparse release planning details resulted in confusion regarding the release delays and was further complicated by unclear and untimely communication to DHS. It is IV&V's understanding that the ASI is planning to assign a Release Manager and produce a Release Plan, but details are limited as of the end of this reporting period


IV&V Findings and Recommendations

IV&V Findings and Recommendations




As of the September 2019 reporting period, PCG is tracking 10 open findings (6 risks and 4 issues), 2 open concerns, and has closed out 26 findings. Of the 10 open risks and issues, 5 are related to Project Management, 2 are related to Configuration and Development, 2 are related to System Design, and 1 related to Deployment. IV&V opened 1 new risk and 1 new concern during the September reporting period and closed 1 issue during the September reporting period. The following figures provide a breakdown of our open risks and issues by priority and category.

Open Risks and Issues




Open Risks and Issues by Category



IV&V Findings and Recommendations



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



IV&V Findings and Recommendations



New Findings Opened During the Reporting Period

#	Finding	Category
40	Risk - Due to inadequate release management practices the project may experience delayed releases, poor release quality, or failed releases.	Deployment

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Findings Closed During the Reporting Period

#	Finding	Category
13	Issue - Differing ASI and ESI expectations regarding DDI environments may impact project schedule and cost.	Configuration and Development

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Preliminary Concerns Investigated During the Reporting Period

#	Finding	Category
41	New - Due to a lack of clarity regarding “Partially Met” requirements in design artifacts, full traceability of requirements may be hampered, and all requirements may not be fully met.	Requirements Management & Analysis
37	Due to inconsistent communication about potential project changes between project executives and the CCB, the CCB’s ability to conduct a complete impact analysis of proposed changes is limited.	Project Management

IV&V Findings and Recommendations




H Project Management

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
2	<p>Issue – Late Delivery of project deliverables may result in schedule delays. As of the September reporting period, IVV has escalated this risk to an issue, with a high criticality rating. The ASI reported two significant project delays this month. The KOLEA MDM implementation planned for October 2019 is now delayed to November/December 2019. The delays on some of the JAD / Workgroup sessions, coupled with the ASI reporting that they have stopped work on most of the TDDs, has delayed the UAT start date for the BES implementation by three weeks. The total impact is still being analyzed by the ASI. The ASI also reported the format of the Functional and Technical Design Document Deliverables have been modified to align to the approved DEDs, of which some have already been submitted to DHS in the prior format and will cause rework for previously submitted FDDs and TDDs. Additionally, the BI-12 Architecture document is on-hold pending DHS/ASI project decisions (with the exception of MDM details for the now November release). Further, the schedule is not updated with the detail to plan when the approximate 1,000 functional and technical design components will be submitted to DHS for review. The ASI also reported the Functional and Technical Design documents will be packaged for DHS review based on those that are ready to review vs. by functional area. It is unclear to IVV if these deliverables will be organized or in a format that provides a cohesive review of the end-to-end solution. IVV will continue to monitor this issue.</p> <p>IVV has escalated this finding to a high issue as of the September 2019 reporting period.</p>	
Recommendations		Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to manage and track the schedule to ensure deliverables are provided as planned. Review the schedule critical path in the weekly schedule review meeting. Continue to meet weekly with DHS to convey new schedule changes, obstacles, and document the corrective actions that will be taken to address schedule delays and obstacle resolution. Determine if the stopped work on TDDs will impact the schedule, and update accordingly Determine if rework to FDDs will impact the schedule, and update accordingly Analyze the project schedule activities to identify any opportunities to make up time resulting from the current delayed activities Develop a process for determining what functionality will be delivered as part of an iteration, determine how many iterations there will be, and update the schedule accordingly 		In Process

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Project Management


#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
5	<p>Risk – The Project Partnership Understanding (PPU) for the BES Project has not been approved by CMS, which may impact the project schedule and funding. IVV has no material update for the September reporting period, however IVV will continue to work with the project to understand status and the road forward. IV&V notes that DHS has offered to be a pilot for CMS’ new “objects-based certification” and is awaiting a follow-up phone with CMS to discuss. If HDS is selected as a pilot, the PPU and MEET checklists may be replaced.</p> <p>IVV maintains this is a low risk to the project as of the September 2019 reporting period.</p>	

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Continue dialogue with CMS regarding the project’s approach to the PPU, IAPDU, and confirm that the MEELC requirements as related to this project.	In Process

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Project Management


#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
26	<p>Risk – Due to the lack of detail in the baseline schedule, unanticipated schedule delays may occur. IVV did not observe substantive change in task decomposition in the schedule (through version 190920). IVV notes that Iteration 3 was added to the project schedule during September. It remains unknown how many iterations are planned or expected. Work efforts across teams for all subsequent iterations is not represented in the current project schedule.</p> <p>IVV maintains this is a medium risk to the project as of the September reporting period.</p>	

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none">IV&V understands DHS and the ASI's efforts to find balance when detailing out the project schedule. It is recommended that all tasks and activities should be decomposed by the individual project leads, and that subsequent details are properly added to the schedule for all current tasks, as well as those commencing within the next 90 days, weekly on a rolling wave basis.	In Process

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Project Management


#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
27	<p>Risk - The baseline schedule lacks proper resource loading which could result in unanticipated schedule delays. IVV did not observe substantive change in resource allocation in the schedule (through v190920). Most named resources remain substantially overallocated over the next 90 days as depicted on the Project Plan's Task Resource Sheet. IVV notes that the previously identified concern about un-named overallocated positions in the schedule over the next 90 days was resolved; this is no longer a concern.</p> <p>IV&V maintains this is a medium risk to the project as of the September reporting period.</p>	

Recommendations	Progress
<p>It is recommended that the ASI perform, at a minimum, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Add all project resources to the project schedule.• Assign all project resources in the schedule to as to all current and planned tasks and activities.• Level load for the next 90 days to ensure the accuracy and attainability of the schedule.	In process

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Project Management


#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
29	<p>Issue - Uncertainty and/or a lack of communication around long term architecture decisions could lead to unexpected impacts to the project budget, schedule, system design, and planning decisions. IVV is aware that architecture discussions continue at the project leadership level that could result in significant change, however, IVV has not been privy to details of changes that are being considered, nor the status of the discussions. During September, IVV learned that Technical Design Document (TDD) development efforts were put on hold as the project awaits possible architecture changes as well as finalization of the BI-12 Architecture Document.</p> <p>Due to the limited information available to IV&V at this time, this remains a high issue to the project as of the September reporting period.</p>	

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Efforts should be made to increase communication to create an awareness of potential architecture changes so that they can prepare for the possibility of a change	Open
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The project should vet possible architectural change impacts to platform, M&O, MQD, and BES systems before finalizing architectural decisions	Open

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



Configuration and Development

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
12	<p>Issue – Changes in direction regarding the preferred platform for portal development may impact project schedule and cost. IVV has no material update for this finding as the updated CR for portal is still outstanding. Concern continues to grow as the project has been in limbo regarding the direction of the portal for approximately six months. It is currently unclear if this delay or its impact to the critical path has been accurately reflected in the schedule or if the ASI had already allotted time for the delay in their original schedule. Given these delays and the fact that deliverables have already been produced assuming a LifeRay platform, IVV is escalating this finding to an issue.</p> <p>IVV has escalated this finding to a medium issue to the project as of the September reporting period.</p>	

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Complete the Change Request (CR) process to obtain a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) estimate and/or impact analysis as appropriate.	In Process

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



M Configuration and Development

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
13	Closed – Differing ASI and ESI expectations regarding DDI environments may impact project schedule and cost. IVV is closing this issue as of the September report as the ETS PAC has reviewed and approved the Contract Amendment to reimburse the ASI for the cloud environments. IVV will continue to monitor the impacts that the contract amendment and the provisioning of the cloud environments may have on the project.	Closed

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ASI work with the State to reach a common understanding of the requirements for the BES DDI environments.• ESI and ASI work together to formulate an environment strategy that will meet the project platform and development needs and minimize impact to the State.	Closed

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



M Configuration and Development

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
16	<p>Issue – Lack of clear understanding of DDI approach may reduce effectiveness of JARs and JADs. IVV reported last month that ASI 'big picture' documentation and presentation fell short of expectations. IVV remains unaware of ASI efforts to provide further information to clarify for DHS the 'big picture' as described in previous updates to this finding. Relatedly, DHS expressed concern that design documents (BI-10, BI-11, BI-14) are being modified after test and RTM documents (BI-20, BI-21) have been released, which could impact the content of both BI-20 and BI-21.</p> <p>The ASI has described their approach for managing cross-JAD interactions through action items and have tasked the lead BA's with managing this as well as identifying/resolving cross-team items.</p> <p>IVV notes that this finding was originally opened over 9 months ago (12/17/2018) and DHS continues to struggle to understand both the ASI DDI approach and whether the approach taken has been or will be effective. Due to this prolonged lack of clarity, IVV is escalating this finding to an issue.</p> <p>IVV has escalated this is finding to a medium issue as of the September reporting period.</p>	M

Recommendations	Progress
PCG recommends one or more of the following to mitigate this risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SI provide an additional DDI approach overview session for stakeholders and allow for Q&A SI provide DDI approach documentation/materials for stakeholders to review and/or refresh their knowledge on demand; the materials could be made available via the project SharePoint 	In Process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCG recommends each new JAD series begin with a brief overview of the DDI approach, including a description of the tools being utilized (use cases, function design documents, technical design documents, etc.), the goals of the session, as well as guidance on how to best provide feedback on what's being shown. 	Open

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



M System Design


#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
36	<p>Risk – As a result of the cross-JAD Action Items process not being fully defined and documented, there is potential for Action Items being overlooked, which could impact design quality, and result in rework. IVV is unaware of additional items being identified as missed or misplaced between JADs during September. As such, IVV is encouraged by the execution of this process and has lowered this risk to low and will continue to monitor.</p> <p>IV&V has reduced this risk to a low rating as of the September reporting period.</p>	

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none">IVV recommends that the management process of moving JAD items from one JAD group to another be fully defined, documented, socialized, and monitored for effectiveness by the ASI and DHS.	In Process

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



System Design

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
38	<p>Risk – Due to the sequencing of JADs addressing Workflow at the end instead of during current JAD sessions, the project could be faced with significant design rework, which may result in schedule delays, and impact the quality of solution design. The ASI has indicated that they are going to work with DHS to determine if changes to JAD sequencing is necessary, however IVV has not been made aware of any proposed changes to the process. IVV will continue to monitor.</p> <p>IV&V maintains this is a medium risk to the project as of the September reporting period.</p>	

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none">IVV recommends that the ASI and DHS work together to determine how best to integrate workflow/task functionality into all JAD sessions so this functionality can be successfully integrated into system design.	Open

IV&V Findings and Recommendations



M Deployment

#	Key Findings	Criticality Rating
40	<p>New Risk - Due to inadequate release management practices the project may experience delayed releases, poor release quality, or failed releases. Release planning does not appear to be sufficient to meet the needs of the project. IVV observed that there was not a SPOC Release Manager assigned to manage the first release for KOLEA. IVV observed that there was a lack of timely release planning for the KOLEA Release, and that communications regarding the release were inconsistent, ineffective, and inaccurate. IVV is unaware if a 'Release Plan' has been fully documented to clearly outline details of the release, including timing of detailed tasks and activities, documentation updates, configuration item updates, and roles and responsibilities of all resources involved from the ASI and DHS.</p> <p>Insufficient release management processes can lead to implementation schedule delays and poor release quality if not managed properly. Insufficient release management processes can also lead to configuration challenges when contents of a release are not well documented. Low quality and/or failed releases could negatively impact system user acceptance and project stakeholder confidence in the solution. Additionally, poor release planning and communication may result in the disruption of business operations.</p>	M

Recommendations	Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assign a Release Manager to manage all details of planned releases. 	New
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a Release Plan document for each release, that provides details of the planned release and all associated configuration items, clear assignments for all staff involved in all tasks, a schedule for completion of all tasks and activities, planned release status communications, and back out procedures should they be necessary. 	New

IV&V Status

IV&V Engagement Status



IV&V Engagement Area	July	Aug	Sep	Comments
IV&V Budget				
IV&V Schedule				
IV&V Deliverables				PCG submitted the final August IV&V Monthly Status Report.
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) IV&V Progress Reports				The first quarterly CMS Eligibility and Enrollment (E&E) IV&V Progress Report is anticipated to be delivered in October 2019 (refer to the PPU submitted to CMS).
CMS Milestone Reviews				The first CMS Milestone Review date has not yet been determined.
IV&V Staffing				
IV&V Scope				

Engagement Rating Legend		
	The engagement area is within acceptable parameters.	
	The engagement area is somewhat outside acceptable parameters.	
	The engagement area poses a significant risk to the IV&V project quality and requires immediate attention.	



- IV&V activities in September reporting period:
 - Completed – August Monthly Status Report
 - Submitted – Comments on BI-10 FSD Iteration 2, BI-11 Data Integration and Interface Control Document Iteration 1, BI-14 Technical Design Document Iteration 1 October Release, BI-16 Data Conversion Plan
 - Ongoing analysis of Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Toolkit (MEET) requirements applicable to BES project
 - Ongoing – Review Deliverables for BES project
 - Ongoing – Attend ASI project meetings, including JADs and Workgroups (see [Additional Inputs](#) pages for details)
- Planned IV&V activities for October reporting period:
 - Continued discussion and analysis of Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Toolkit (MEET) requirements applicable to BES project with DHS PMO and BES Project Director
 - Ongoing – Observe BES JAD and Workgroup sessions
 - Ongoing – Observe Weekly Project Status meetings
 - Ongoing – Observe bi-weekly BES Project Risk and Issue meetings
 - Ongoing – Monthly IV&V findings meetings with Unisys
 - Ongoing – Participate in weekly DHS and IV&V Touch Base meetings
 - Ongoing – Review BES artifacts and deliverables

Deliverables Reviewed



Deliverable Name	Deliverable Date	Version
BI-02 Project Status Report Deliverable	Weekly	N/A
BI-05 Project Schedule Deliverable –Baseline	190830 Baseline 190906 Baseline 190913 Baseline 190920 Baseline	N/A
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Template	09/18/2019	N/A
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 CF01a Use Case – Automatically Schedule and Appointment	09/05/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 CF01a FDD – Automatically Schedule and Appointment	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 CF01b Use Case – Manually Schedule an Appointment	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 CF01b FDD – Manually Schedule an Appointment	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 CF02 Use Case – View Appointments	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 CF02 FDD – View Appointment	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 CF03 Use Case – Manage Appointment Schedules	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 CF03 FDD – Manage Appointment Schedules	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 PR02 SNAP Eligibility Policy Logic Document	09/10/2019	V1.0

Deliverables Reviewed



Deliverable Name	Deliverable Date	Version
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 PR03 Expedited SNAP Policy Document	09/10/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 PR04 SNAP Household Composition Policy Logic Document	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 PR05 SNAP Household Income Policy Logic Document	09/10/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 PR06 SNAP Resources Policy Logic Document	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 PR07 SNAP Work Requirements Policy Logic Document	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 PR08 SNAP Expenses and Deductions Policy Logic Document	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 PR09 SNAP Application Processing Policy Logic Document	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 PR10 SNAP Change Reporting Policy Logic Document	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-10 Functional and System Design Document Iteration 2 PR11 SNAP Benefit Amount Policy Logic Document	09/09/2019	V1.0
BI-11 Data Integration and Interface Control Document Template	09/18/2019	N/A
BI-11 Data Integration and Interface Control Document Iteration 1 IF02 HAWI – MDM Batch Use Case	09/17/2019	V1.0
BI-11 Data Integration and Interface Control Document Iteration 1 IF02 HAWI – MDM Batch ICD 2019.10	09/17/2019	V1.0

Additional Inputs – Artifacts



Deliverable Name	Deliverable Date	Version
BI-11 Data Integration and Interface Control Document Iteration 1 IF03_KOLEA – MDM Real-Time Use Case	09/17/2019	V1.0
BI-11 Data Integration and Interface Control Document Iteration 1 IF03_KOLEA – MDM Real-Time ICD 2019.10	09/17/2019	V1.0
BI-14 Technical Design Document Template	09/18/2019	N/A
BI-16 Data Conversion Plan	08/26/2019	V1.0
BI-21 Updated and Completed Functional and Technical Requirements Traceability Matrix	09/18/2019	V1.0
BI-24 OCM and Stakeholder Communication Plan	09/12/2019	N/A

Additional Inputs – Artifacts



Artifact Name	Artifact Date	Version
Decision Log	09/4/2019 09/11/2019 09/18/2019 09/25/2019	N/A
Functional Design Action Item Process	09/5/2019 09/12/2019 09/19/2019 09/26/2019	N/A
BES Risk and Issue Log (Excel)	09/4/2019 09/11/2019 09/18/2019 09/25/2019	
JAD Calendar	09/5/2019 09/12/2019 09/19/2019 09/26/2019	N/A
BES RFP and Unisys BAFO		






Meetings and/or Sessions Attended/Observed:

- Project Status Meetings x4 (9/4/2019, 9/11/2019, 9/18/2019, 9/25/2019)
- BESSD PMO, IV&V Weekly Meeting x3 (9/4/2019, 9/11/2019, 9/18/2019)
- Internal PCG Team Meetings x7 (9/03/2019, 9/09/2019, 9/16/2019, 9/19/2019, 9/23/2019, 9/26/2019, 9/30/2019)
- Change Control Board Meetings x2 (9/04/2019, 9/18/2019, 9/25/2019)
- Project Schedule Review Meetings x4 (9/03/2019, 9/10/2019, 9/17/2019, 9/24/2019)
- Business Roundtable Meeting (9/05/2019)
- Monthly Stakeholder IV&V Report Review Meeting (9/10/2019)
- ALM Follow Up Meeting (9/18/2019)
- Administrative Hearings Workgroup Meetings x2 (9/12/2019, 9/26/2019)
- CORE JAD x2 (09/24/2019, 09/25/2019)
- Self Service Portal JAD x4 (9/04/2019, 9/05/2019, 9/10/2019, 9/11/2019)
- MDM, Referrals, and Consent Management Workgroup Meetings x2 (9/17/2019, 9/24/2019)

Appendices



Appendix A – IV&V Criticality Ratings

Criticality Rating	Definition
 H	A high rating is assigned if there is a possibility of substantial impact to product quality, scope, cost, or schedule. A major disruption is likely and the consequences would be unacceptable. A different approach is required. Mitigation strategies should be evaluated and acted upon immediately.
 M	A medium rating is assigned if there is a possibility of moderate impact to product quality, scope, cost, or schedule. Some disruption is likely and a different approach may be required. Mitigation strategies should be evaluated and implemented as soon as feasible.
 L	A low rating is assigned if there is a possibility of slight impact to product quality, scope, cost, or schedule. Minimal disruption is likely and some oversight is most likely needed to ensure that the risk remains low. Mitigation strategies should be considered for implementation when possible.

Appendix B – Findings Log



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

Appendix C – Acronyms and Glossary



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



Appendix C – Acronyms and Glossary

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

Appendix C – Acronyms and Glossary



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

Appendix D – Background Information



Systems Modernization Project

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

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

Systems Modernization IV&V Project

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

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

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

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

Appendix D – Background Information



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

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

PCG's Eclipse IV&V® Technical Assessment Methodology

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

IV&V Assessment Categories for the BES Project

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



www.publicconsultinggroup.com

Finding Number	Title	Observation	Significance	Recommendation	Event Horizon	Impact	Probability	Analyst Priority	Finding Status	Date Retired	Status Update	Client Comments	Vendor Comments
41	Due to a lack of clarity regarding "Partially Met" requirements in design artifacts, full traceability of requirements may be hampered, and all requirements may not be fully met	Requirements are listed in Design artifacts as being "Partially Met". With hundreds of planned design artifacts, it is unclear how complete traceability for each requirement will be accomplished both within the design artifacts and within ALM. IVV recognizes the "requirement split" process in ALM, however it does not currently address the complete implementation of a requirement that is partially met in multiple places.	If requirements are not completely traced throughout the SDLC, it may result in missing functionality and reduced scope.	Determine a requirements management and design artifact that provides full accountability of where each and every component of a requirement that is listed as "Partially Met" is satisfied, ensuring that each requirement is Fully Met and can be validated as such.	Q4 2019	0	0	N/A	Open		9/30/2019 - IVV received additional information from the ASI on 9/30 regarding how partially met requirements are being tracked. IVV is concerned that the current process is not thorough enough to provide full traceability of partially met requirements, and will follow up with the ASI and DHS in October.	10/10/19 SB: The ASI believes the current process tracks requirements appropriately and will work with DHS and the IV and V to address their remaining concerns.	
40	Due to inadequate release management practices the project may experience delayed releases, poor release quality, or failed releases	Release planning does not appear to be sufficient to meet the needs of the project. IVV observed that there was not a SPOC Release Manager assigned to manage the first release for KOLEA. IVV observed that there was a lack of timely release planning for the KOLEA Release, and that communications regarding the release were inconsistent, ineffective, and inaccurate. IVV is unaware if a "Release Plan" has been fully documented to clearly outline details of the release, including timing of detailed tasks and activities, documentation updates, configuration item updates, and roles and responsibilities of all resources involved from the ASI and DHS.	Insufficient release management processes can lead to implementation schedule delays and poor release quality if not managed properly. Insufficient release management processes can also lead to configuration challenges when contents of a release are not well documented. Low quality and/or failed releases could negatively impact system user acceptance and project stakeholder confidence in the solution. Additionally, poor release planning and communication may result in the disruption of business operations.	Assign a Release Manager to manage all details of planned releases. Develop a Release Plan document for each release, that provides details of the planned release and all associated configuration items, clear assignments for all staff involved in all tasks, a schedule for completion of all tasks and activities, planned release status communications, and back out procedures should they be necessary.	OCT 2019	3	3	Med	Open			10/10/19 SB: The ASI had named a release manager for the October release, who is actively engaged. The ASI also named a release manager for the January and future releases that would have worked remotely. DHS requested that the release manager be onsite. The ASI has assigned a release manager who will be more readily available onsite, as well as allocating additional resources to the KOLEA activities. These assignments have been shared with DHS project leadership and PMO and are in place. A general team announcement of these assignments will be made when the ASI completes workshare arrangements with the ASI team. The October release being the first DDI related release has experienced some start up issues in the content and review of project deliverables. Those start up issues have been addressed with high priority and the ASI will continue to work actively with DHS to address all concerns.	
38	Due to the sequencing of JADs addressing Workflow at the end instead of during current JAD sessions, the project could be faced with significant design rework, which may result in schedule delays, and impact the quality of solution design	ASI-led JAD sessions are currently divided up into functional areas (Portal, Admin Appeals, Core, Financial, etc.) and have been ongoing since approximately March 2019. Workflow/task JAD's have yet to begin. Currently, when functional area design discussions involve a workflow/task, the discussion is tabled because the ASI has yet to define how the workflow/task will be implemented. The ASI has stated that once the workflow/task functionality is defined, they will go back and update the existing designs to include this functionality.	Stopping (or putting on hold) design and process flow discussions during JAD's can result in an incomplete understanding of future processes. Uninformed design decisions could lead to significant rework, confusion among SME's and the ASI project team, unproductive analysis discussions, and a poor design. Further, if DHS is asked to sign off on designs that lack clear workflow/task functionality, they could be signing off on a poor or incomplete design.	- ASI work quickly to define how the workflow/task functionality will work, train BA session leads - Introduce SME's to workflow/task functionality and integrate into system designs.	ASAP	4	4	Med	Open		9/30/19 - The ASI has indicated that they are going to work with DHS to determine if changes to JAD sequencing is necessary, however IVV has not been made aware of any proposed changes to the process. IVV will continue to monitor.	09/12/19 SB: The ASI will work with DHS in assessing whether to change the current schedule for these functional areas. 10/10/19 SB: The ASI meets with DHS multiple times a week and there has been no request to alter the sequence of upcoming sessions.	
37	Due to inconsistent communication about potential project changes between project executives and the CCB, the CCB's ability to conduct a complete impact analysis of proposed changes is limited.	While the CCB is the Project forum for logging, tracking, and deciding on CCB items, decisions on outstanding CRs are not always made within the CCB and its members; decisions on several CRs are made at the executive management level as appropriate. At times this leads to limited transparency to the CCB and its associated processes for ensuring the impacts of all planned changes are fully understood. IVV notes that there is at least one documented instance of work being performed and completed prior to the associated CR being signed off and approved.	Change Management process transparency and consistency is needed to ensure that all project stakeholders are on the same page as to project scope, schedule, cost, and quality.	IVV recommends that the Change Management process be re-evaluated to ensure complete transparency for all project partners and stakeholders.	October 2019	0	0	NA	Open		09/30/2019. IVV is unaware of any process re-evaluations initiated in this regard. No CCB impact assessments or CR approvals were completed during September. IVV continues to monitor this concern.	09/12/19 SB: The ASI is working closely with DHS on the CR's that are in flight. When decisions are finalized, the ASI will ensure the status will be provided to project partners and stakeholders. 10/10/19 SB: The ASI is having active communication on potential CR's with DHS which is appropriate. When a CR is ready for the CCB process to engage, the process has engaged. More specifics would be helpful to address IV and V's concern.	
36	As a result of the cross-JAD Action Items process not being fully defined and documented, there is potential for Action Items being overlooked, which could impact design quality, and result in rework	IVV understands that cross-JAD items are discussed in the bi-weekly ASI Roundtable session and that this process is currently being managed by a single individual. However IVV is unaware of a written process for ensuring management coordination of both a 'send' and a 'receive' of JAD items moving from one JAD to another. Variance in execution of this process could lead to missing functionality.	If the Cross-JAD handoff process is not fully defined, documented, socialized, and uniformly executed, JAD items may fall through the cracks and requirements may be missed. This could potentially lead to uninformed gaps in design, as well as unanticipated rework.	Due to the importance of an accurate design, IVV recommends that the management process of moving JAD items from one JAD group to another be fully defined, documented, and monitored for effectiveness by the ASI and DHS.	September 2019	3	2	Low	Open		09/30/2019. IVV is unaware of additional items being identified as missed or misplaced between JADs during September. As such, IVV is encouraged by the execution of this process and has lowered this risk to low, and will continue to monitor.	09/12/19 SB: This process is in place and is reviewed at the standing daily checkpoint meeting, as part of the JAD improvements work sessions, the weekly design sessions and at the roundtables. The ASI will document this process. 10/10/19 SB: The ASI meets with DHS multiple times a week in standing meetings and this issue has not been brought forward in September.	
35	Due to the high volume of design rework anticipated by the ASI, the planned use of Controlled Correspondence to manage updates to design artifacts may complicate the review and approval process of FDDs/TDDs and could result in schedule delays.	The ASI has determined that the Controlled Correspondence process will be used to manage re-approval of changes to previously approved design artifacts. The ASI has previously mentioned that the design execution methodology being employed for BES may result in 20-25% rework of documentation and/or software. Due to the high anticipated volume, it is unclear if the Controlled Correspondence process will be sufficient to handle the timing needs of the changes, as well as the anticipated volume of changes.	If the design documentation gets out of sync, there is a high likelihood of missed requirements and associated rework.	IVV recommends that the usage of the Controlled Correspondence process for this be collaboratively discussed with the ASI, DHS, and IVV to ensure that the design documentation and associated code are kept current and made available on a timely basis for all project participants.	September 2019	0	0	NA	Retired	9/16/2019	9/16/2019 - The ASI has stated that they plan to use the Functional Design Process and Plan document's Change Management process for updates to previously approved design artifacts. IV&V is closing this concern, but will monitor this process throughout its life.	9/12/19 SB: IV&V's understanding is incorrect as to the process for document changes. There is a process for document revisions that is included by reference as part of the Functional Design process manual. This Functional Design Process Manual was included by reference to the recently approved Bi-6 System DDI Plan. The ASI has also previously reviewed the document revision process with the IV&V at their request. The document revision process was designed to be speedier than the Controlled Correspondence process precisely for the reasons cited in the observation. The ASI can review the process with the IV&V again upon request.	
32	Due to inconsistent execution of the Decision Management process, the project may not be tracking all relevant information, which could lead to a lack of awareness and an inefficient use of time and resources	IVV has observed that there is inconsistent execution of the Decision log process. - Most entries are missing entry one or more of the following important fields: Decision Date, Decision Comments, Impact of Decision, Alternatives Considered, and/or Links to Supplemental Documents. - The 'Impact of Decision' field is completed as 'Other' for many Decision entries, obscuring access to important historical data.	If Decision logs are inconsistently used, communication can become hampered and a common understanding of decisions may be difficult to attain.	- Determine which fields in the Decision Log should be mandatory vs optional. - Force entry going forward for all needed fields, and audit the data entered into the log to ensure consistent use. - Also consider backfilling missing data in the log at the earliest possible juncture, before the data to be entered is forgotten.	Q3 2019	3	2	Low	Retired	7/31/2019	07/31/2019 - IVV is closing this risk, as it has been addressed by the ASI. The SharePoint Decision Log has been updated to require data entry in required fields and has gone back to fill in missing data on existing Decisions entries.		
31	As result of the draft baseline project schedule having a large number of late tasks, the project does not have an accurate baseline of tasks or milestones that can be managed to, which could lead to schedule delays and resource over allocation.	The baselined schedule ('190524 draft baseline') accepted by DHS on May 23, 2019 has 182 tasks that are already late.	Late tasks typically lead to overall project delays. One of the primary benefits of baselining a schedule is to 'true-up' progress and ensure that any and all late tasks are re-scheduled to a timeframe that they can be accomplished. It is not considered a project management best practice to baseline a schedule with multiple tasks being recorded as late from the outset.	The ASI should update and re-schedule all late tasks as a component of the baselining effort, to ensure schedule attainability.	Q3 2019	3	2	Low	Retired	7/31/2019	07/31/2019 - IVV validates that the number of late tasks in the latest schedule version (190726) has been reduced to four tasks, and the ASI has acknowledged that this is the baseline schedule they'll be managing to moving forward. As such, IVV is closing this risk. However, IVV will continue to monitor updates made to the schedule, ensuring that all deliverables and milestones are accurately tracked within the schedule. Particular attention will be paid to items not yet fully flushed out, including but not limited to Data Conversion and the 90/10 accelerated items. 06/28/2019 - IVV validates that this condition still persists in the latest published version of the schedule (190614). The number of late tasks has grown from 182 to 200 in the last two versions of the schedule. IVV will plan to re-review to determine if this condition persists when updated schedules are published and made available for review.	06/11/19 S Brown: The submission of Bi 5 Project Schedule is a point in time schedule. The ASI is actively reviewing and updating the schedule, with a weekly update provided to the client.	
30	As a result of the ASI's risk management execution not aligning with the published Risk Management Plan, the project may realize unanticipated impacts to schedule and budget.	The Issue Log "Action Plan" field does not seem to be utilized for the action plan, rather, it contains risk update notes. Further, the Risk log seems to be missing several fields that were identified in the Risk Management Plan, namely: Severity, Impact Category, Source, Probability, Risk Triggering Event, Monitoring Plan, Mitigation Plan, Contingency Plan. It is unclear if risk mitigation plans/strategies have been developed/document for current project risks.	Failure to effectively track important risk details and mitigation plans can lead to ineffective risk management which can increase the likelihood of impactful risks (schedule and budget) being realized.	It is recommended that the ASI review their Risk Management Plan and ensure that their risk management log and their risk management process execution aligns with the plan. This includes the following: - The plan states, "the contingency plan is developed in the Contingency Plan field and notes surrounding the execution of the plan are documented in the Notes field. At a minimum, monthly, the owner should record that the risk and the risk action plan is still appropriate". - The Risk Management Plan states, "Risk tracking is essential to effective action plan implementation. This means devising the risk metrics and triggering events needed to make sure that the planned risk actions are working". - The plan states, "Risk tracking is essential to effective action plan implementation. This means devising the risk metrics and triggering events needed to make sure that the planned risk actions are working".	ASAP	0	0	NA	Retired	6/30/2019	6/30/19 - The ASI has updated fields in their risk/issue log to better reflect what has been stated in their risk management plan. IVV will close this finding. 6/26/19 - The ASI recognizes they need to make efforts to properly update fields/data elements in their risk and issue management tools and have indicated their intent to resolve this risk. IVV will continue to monitor corrective measures and progress.	06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI requests specifics related to this finding.	

Finding Number	Title	Observation	Significance	Recommendation	Event Horizon	Impact	Probability	Analyst Priority	Finding Status	Date Retired	Status Update	Client Comments	Vendor Comments
29	Uncertainty and/or a lack of communication around long term architecture decisions could lead to unexpected impacts to project budget, schedule, system design, and planning decisions.	Some platform and BES system architecture decisions have yet to be made and socialized to the project. For example, the ASI and DHS have stated that they have reached agreement that the project will move forward with implementing two Siebel instances (one for KOLEA, one for BES), but this is not currently reflected in the project change log or the project decision log. It remains unclear if the details of the rationale for this decision or the plan for integrating the two instances post go-live have been thoroughly vetted and/or documented. Further, there may be some uncertainty around whether when/if all environments (including KOLEA and BES production) will be moved to the cloud.	The current project architecture and design should be as representative and inclusive of all known future solution plans as possible. As an example, if KOLEA and BES are to move to a single instance of Siebel in the future, planning for that integration should be incorporated into the project now. If such significant future changes are not planned for now, the project is likely to see increased complexity, rework, and costs when integrating the two systems in the future.	- DHS request ASI perform due diligence in any recommendation for foundational architecture change decisions. - The project should vet possible architectural change impacts to platform, M and O, MCO, and BES systems before finalizing architectural decisions. - Efforts should be made to increase communication to create an awareness of possible architecture changes so that they can prepare for the possibility of a change. For example, if there is a possibility that the platform could change then analysis/design could focus on platform agnostic design and avoid extensive efforts in refining a platform specific design.	ASAP	4	5	High	Open		9/30/19 - IVV is aware that architecture discussions continue at the project leadership level that could result in significant change, however, IVV has not been privy to details of changes that are being considered, nor the status of the discussions. During September, IVV learned that Technical Design Document (TDD) development efforts were put on hold as the project awaits possible architecture changes as well as finalization of the BI-12 Architecture Document. 8/29/19 - Some platform and BES system architecture decisions have yet to be made and socialized to the project. For example, the ASI and DHS have stated that they have reached agreement that the project will move forward with implementing two Siebel instances (one for KOLEA, one for BES), but this is not currently reflected in the project change log or the project decision log. It remains unclear if the details of the rationale for this decision or the plan for integrating the two instances post go-live have been thoroughly vetted and/or documented. Further, there may be some uncertainty around whether when/if all environments (including KOLEA and BES production) will be moved to the cloud. 8/21/19 - ASI has put the projects Architecture Plan (BI-12) deliverable on hold due to uncertainty around key architecture decisions (e.g. LifeRay vs. Adobe portal platform). 7/31/19 - During a 7/30/19 ASI/DHS schedule review meeting, the PMO was surprised to find that some environments they had expected to be in the cloud were scheduled to be treated on-premises. In response, DHS logged decision #56 in the project decision log regarding Unisys creating cloud environments, and DHS reimbursing them. IVV is awaiting additional information regarding changes to the currently proposed architectural approach. 6/26/19 - While DHS has indicated architecture changes are currently being discussed, no clear details have been made available to IVV. Until such details are provided, IVV will continue to track this as a preliminary concern.	06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI requests clarity on what long term architectural decisions are being referred to. 10/10/19 SB: The ASI is working on the KOLEA specific content of BI-12 and this has been relayed to DHS.	
28	Lack of planning and risk mitigation in response to outstanding key change request decisions could result in unplanned consequences to scope, schedule, cost, or quality.	IVV has observed multiple CRs that have been open for three months or more with little updates and contingency planning communicated to the project. Two examples include: CR 2018-003a for use of Adobe as opposed to Liferay was submitted on 12/12/2018, and it has had a status of 'being under evaluation' since 2/12/2019 and CR 2018-005a for single Siebel instance was opened on 2/8/2019 and put ON HOLD on 4/23/2019. Both of these CRs present notable change to project scope and are likely to impact current and future project planning, cost, schedule, and resources. As final decisions on these CRs remain outstanding, there has been no formal communication of action plans or risk mitigation strategies to the project until a decision is made.	When key project change decisions are delayed or put on hold, the project may lack clear understanding of status and direction on how to proceed until a final decision is made. This lack of direction can result in delayed or unplanned affects to project scope, schedule, cost, or quality	In instances where CR delays are unavoidable, the project should document action plans and risk mitigation strategies in advance of final CR decisions and ensure that those plans are clearly communicated to the project in a timely manner.	Q3 2019	0	0	NA	Retired	6/28/2019	IVV is closing this finding based on progress in June on both CRs. DHS and the ASI have agreed to submit and process a replacement CR for using Adobe for the KOLEA portal, and IVV has been made aware that executive-level discussions are taking place surrounding other architectural components. IVV will continue to monitor this project area.	06/11/19 S Brown: CR's are addressed on the standing CCR monthly meeting. At this time, all open CR's are with the client for next steps. The ASI has identified potential impacts to the project in our status reporting.	
27	The baseline schedule lacks proper resource loading which could result in unanticipated schedule delays	The draft baseline schedule does not include all resource assignments, and most of the lead resources that are added to the schedule are largely over allocated. The RFP and the ASI proposal both require a fully resource-loaded project schedule. - All lead project staff are all over allocated through the next 90 days. Over allocation ranges from 16 hrs/day to 136 hrs/day. The ASI has stated that they will only track resource assignments for lead staff, which obfuscates transparency. - 'Unknown' project staff (Identify Mgmt Lead, Integration Lead, Siebel Dev Lead, OPA Lead, BI Architect, Data Architect, Tech Writers) are ALL over allocated. Over allocation ranges from 24-36 hrs/day - There are over 68,000 hours of work assigned to 'Unisys'. - There are over 19,000 hours of work assigned to 'DHS'. - There are over 7,000 hours of work assigned to 'DHS Technical'.	The project's ability to understand 'which' staff are working on 'what' project tasks is obscured. Such extreme over allocation of resources can result in unplanned schedule delays, and unobtainable task end dates and milestones. This condition in the schedule is an indication that one or more of the following may be occurring: there may not be enough resources to accomplish the planned tasks in accordance with the schedule; tasks may not have been fully decomposed to the appropriate level; resource assignments may not have been fully planned out and/or assigned.	It is recommended that the ASI perform, at a minimum, the following: - Add all project resources to the project schedule. - Assign all project resources in the schedule to as to all current and planned tasks and activities. - Level load for the next 90 days to ensure the accuracy and attainability of the schedule. - If, upon completing the above, resource gaps exist, the project may want need to consider bringing on additional resources as needed to meet the schedule.	July 2019	4	2	Med	Open		09/30/2019 - IVV did not observe substantive change in resource allocation in the schedule (through V190920). Most named resources remain substantially over allocated over the next 90 days as depicted on the Project Plan's Task Resource Sheet. IVV notes that the previously identified concern about un-named over allocated positions in the schedule over the next 90 days was resolved; this is no longer a concern. 08/31/2019 - IVV did not observe substantive change in the latest schedule version regarding this risk. Most named resources are still over allocated over the next 90 days as depicted on the Project Plan's Task Resource Sheet. IVV notes that the previously identified positions without named resources that were also over allocated over the next 90 days have had their task allocations dramatically reduced. IVV is unclear on why or how these over allocated resources workload were reduced but will further investigate in September. ** Note - IVV removed the word 'draft' from the finding title as the schedule is no longer in draft status, but the risk remains relevant. IVV maintains this is a medium risk to the project as of the August reporting period. 07/31/2019 - While it is noted that the ASI has started to address this, most named resources are still over allocated over the next 90 days, as depicted on the Project Plan's Task Resource Sheet. Of significance is the fact that there are currently 9 positions without named resources that are also over allocated over the next 90 days. IVV will continue to monitor this risk to verify that staff resourcing within the schedule is accurately depicted. 06/28/2019 - IVV validates that this condition still persists in the latest published version of the schedule (190614). IVV will re-review to determine if this condition persists when an updated schedule is published. IVV notes that DHS and the ASI are collaboratively working to identify an appropriate level of resourcing tasks and activities in the project schedule, and that this finding was included in the DHS Action Plan for the ASI in June 2019. IVV maintains this is a medium risk to the project as of the June reporting period.	06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI will continue to update and level resource allocations. 10/10/19 SB: The ASI did meet with IV and V after the Monthly review call for the September report and did walk through numerous updates. The ASI requests the IV and V to update this finding based on the latest report.	

Finding Number	Title	Observation	Significance	Recommendation	Event Horizon	Impact	Probability	Analyst Priority	Finding Status	Date Retired	Status Update	Client Comments	Vendor Comments
26	Due to the lack of detail in the baseline schedule, unanticipated schedule delays may occur	The tasks and activities listed in the project schedule for the next 90 days have not been decomposed to a level to where actual progress can accurately be measured. IVV has become aware that some project leads are using Excel, Trello, or other tools to track task and activity details within their respective areas of responsibility.	If all tasks and activities are not thoroughly decomposed in a common manner using MS Project, it is highly likely that sub-plans recorded elsewhere will at times not be in sync with and/or congruent with overall project plans. This type of approach often times results in unplanned activity and/or project delays, and hinders the project's ability to sufficiently plan for the appropriate resources to be involved in each task.	IVV continues to recommend that all tasks and activities are thoroughly decomposed by the individual project leads, and that subsequent details are properly added to the schedule for all current tasks, as well as those commencing within the next 90 days, weekly on a rolling wave basis.	July 2019	3	3	Med	Open		09/30/2019 - IVV did not observe substantive change in task decomposition in the schedule (through version 190920). IVV notes that Iteration 3 was added to the project schedule during September. It remains unknown how many iterations are planned or expected. Work efforts across teams for all subsequent iterations is not represented in the current project schedule. 08/31/2019 - No substantive update for the August reporting period. Tasks specific to JADs/Workgroups in the next 90 days continue to be updated, added, and/or further decomposed through the 8/23/19 version of the schedule. The Data Conversion schedule has been added to the Project Work plan, and up-to-date status on it is expected in early September. IVV notes that the October Release schedule details are managed in a work plan that is separate from the Baseline Project Work plan, and that milestones from the October Release work plan are provided in the Baseline Project Work plan. ** Note - IVV removed the word 'draft' from the finding title as the schedule is no longer in draft status, but the risk remains relevant. IVV maintains this is a medium risk to the project as of the August reporting period. 07/31/2019 - IVV notes that many tasks (e.g., specific to JADs and Workgroups) in the next 90 days have been updated, added, and/or further decomposed since the last published version of the schedule. IVV acknowledges the positive changes made to the schedule details and will continue to monitor this item over the 90-day period from 7/19/19 through 10/18/19 to verify that the level of detail in the schedule continues to improve. Additionally, IVV notes that all data conversion tasks have been removed and will be replaced by other tasks and activities during August. 06/28/2019 - IVV validates that this condition still persists in the latest published version of the schedule (190614). IVV will re-review to determine if this condition persists when an updated schedule is published. IVV notes that DHS and the ASI are collaboratively working to identify an appropriate level of task details in the project schedule, and that this finding was included in the DHS Action Plan for the ASI in June 2019.	06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI agreed to add additional detail once the schedule is baselined, as discussed with the client. 09/12/19 SB: The ASI and DHS have a weekly meeting to review the schedule in great detail. The ASI and DHS are evaluating options to simplify the schedule and work item tracking process. 10/10/19 SB: The ASI did meet with IV and V after the Monthly review call for the September report and did walk through numerous updates. The ASI requests the IV and V to update this finding based on the latest review.	
25	Lack of written communication may cause confusion within the project team.	The Project Leadership Team (DHS and Unisys) does not provide written documentation regarding significant events that should be communicated to the project team to avoid confusion, validate DHS and Unisys have a common understanding, and/or document required action for unplanned activities. Specific examples include the DHS request to Unisys for the JAR/JAD corrective action plan (CAP); the delivery of the CAP from Unisys to DHS; DHS comments and/or acceptance of the JAD CAP; DHS request to halt the JAD sessions until the CAP is approved; the list of activities necessary for the State to review/approve the Project Schedule.	Insufficient documentation of key decisions may lead to confusion within the project team regarding work assignments that are no longer priority, shifting of resources to new work and overall alignment of the project to the changed goals and objectives. It may also cause confusion within the project team regarding the key activities and their chronological order as agreed to by the Projects Sponsor and Stakeholders.	Provide written documentation using the Controlled Correspondence Process or the Project Decision Log for all activities or events that may impact the specific work assigned to staff, the schedule or the budget to (1) clearly articulate the situation (2) document the steps necessary to overcome the situation (3) share with the project team so that downstream impacts are identified (4) identify areas where the staff should be realigned to work on unplanned activities, if necessary.	ASAP	2	2	Med	Retired	6/28/2019	6/28/2019 - IVV observed progress made by DHS and the ASI in the June reporting period, including DHS entering past key events into the decision log, and the ASI continuing to update the JAD calendar and conducting project Stand Up meetings to share status and identify key activities in progress or planned in the near future. Overall, IVV has observed enough progress to close this finding. However, specific concerns remain regarding communication around architecture decisions and the decision-making process, both of which are tracked under separate findings (#29 and #32). 5/31/2019 - Originally this finding was opened as a concern. After discussions with the DHS PMO and Unisys in separate meetings on 5/15/2019, IVV changed it from a concern to an issue as both DHS PMO and Unisys agreed these events should be formally documented. DHS PMO indicated they would prefer to use the Projects Decision Log vs. Controlled Correspondence, both are good options. IVV notes the ASI provided the IVV with the Functional Cycle Performance Improvement Plan 02092019 V3 (7).ppt that provides the high-level plan and steps necessary to re-start the JAD/Workgroup Sessions. IVV also notes that DHS and the ASI have logged some of the past events in the Decision Log. IVV will monitor this over the next couple of months.	06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI disagrees with the rating of this item. As evidence that written communication has been provided, the ASI provided status updates to the client of week on week progress against items identified in the Performance Improvement plan, scheduled and held of weekly Design Leadership meetings and published agenda's and minutes. The ASI and client are also holding daily stand up meetings to ensure the workgroups and JADs are progressing as expected and taking any corrective action needed.	
24	Insufficient utilization of modern productivity tools (e.g., SharePoint)	The ASI prefers to use traditional tools (e.g., Excel) as opposed to modern, more efficient productivity tools (e.g., SharePoint) that provide greater functionality and empower stronger collaboration on and sharing of project information.	Usage of modern productivity tools are typically proven effective in organizing and providing visibility to information that can increase stakeholder awareness and productivity as well as encourage project engagement. For example, while some project information would be better stored in a SharePoint list the project often chooses to utilize traditional Excel spreadsheets that lack the same versioning and shared use capabilities as SharePoint lists. SharePoint Lists are often utilized as up to date repositories for information that can easily be accessed, updated, filtered, and sorted (without the need to open a document). Often, stakeholders will avoid looking for information if they need to search through SharePoint document libraries and then search through multiple documents to compile information that is buried in one or more Word/Excel document.	It is recommended that the ASI acquire modern productivity tool (e.g., SharePoint) expertise to ensure effective use of more advanced tool productivity capabilities. Additionally, the ASI should collaborate with DHS to identify information/spreadsheets that could be more effectively stored in SharePoint Lists for better shared use, easy access, and dissemination of information.	May 2019	1	3	Low	Retired	6/28/2019	6/26/19 - IVV maintains that the ASI should continue to focus on improving the usage of information sharing and productivity tools, such as SharePoint, however, is closing this risk in the June 2019 report as the risk to the project is currently low, and has been accepted by the project. 5/22/19 - The ASI has indicated that DHS approved use of some manual methods (e.g., spreadsheets) over modern productivity tools (e.g., SharePoint), however, DHS clarified that this is not their preferred method. IVV maintains this is a low risk as of the May 2019 reporting period.	06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI requests additional detail regarding the classification and measurement of this as a risk to the project.	

Finding Number	Title	Observation	Significance	Recommendation	Event Horizon	Impact	Probability	Analyst Priority	Finding Status	Date Retired	Status Update	Client Comments	Vendor Comments
23	Lack of overall productivity since project inception.	Some of DHS stakeholders have expressed frustration that the project has not met expectations and, though the project schedule has yet to be re-baselined and finalized, there is a perceived lack of ASI progress over the past 7 months (since project kickoff) by many stakeholders. It is unclear if the ASI has accounted for or has a mitigation plan for this shortfall in productivity or if they can assure key milestones will be met now that JADs have been put on hold.	The perceived lack of ASI productivity by the client can hinder client engagement and negatively impact team buy-in and morale. Waning productivity can lead to negative impacts to project quality, schedule, budget, and resources and compromise the project's return on investment. While the ASI maintains the project end date remains unchanged, it is not clear how this can be verified given the unapproved schedule, JADs being on hold, and the number of deliverables that have been submitted as draft and are still not approved. This lack of productivity can result in unexpected schedule extensions and budget cuts that could negatively impact the quality of project deliverables as well as limit contract flexibility.	The ASI should produce, communicate, then execute a clear plan for addressing the project's productivity concerns as they relate to lack of quality, poor customer service, resourcing issues, process issues (including JADs), schedule issues, and deliverable/documentation shortcomings. Additionally, the ASI should ensure that senior resources are appropriately assigned and effectively involved in the project, in an effort to improve quality and restore confidence in the ASI's ability to effectively execute their contract.	ASAP	4	4	High	Retired	6/28/2019	6/23/19 - In an effort to more accurately and effectively communicate and track IVV's concerns about productivity, specifically regarding performance against the project schedule, JADs, and execution of project management processes, IVV is closing this risk and will be tracking these concerns at a more granular level. IVV is tracking the following productivity-related findings: • Schedule – Findings 2, 26, 27, 31 • JADs – Finding 15 • Project Management Processes – Findings 30, 32, 5/31/19 - While both the PMP and Project Schedule were approved in May, IVV remains concerned about the overall productivity of the ASI. Some observations and concerns are below: - There are indications of schedule slippage, such as JAD sessions that were originally scheduled for completion in June 2019 are now slated for completion in December 2019 (when comparing 11/24/2018 schedule and the 5/24/2019 schedule). - DHS leadership remains concerned that the project team's overall lack of experience has led to several unproductive meetings/work sessions and delayed project activities. - It is unclear if ASI leadership shares the DHS perception of a lack of experienced BA Leads - Unisys has stated that an action plan document is underway to address productivity and quality concerns, however this plan is largely undocumented. As part of this action plan, the ASI has provided an updated org chart, however, changes mostly reflect a reshuffle of existing resources and therefore may not sufficiently address the team's overall perceived lack of experience. IVV is aware that the ASI is taking steps to make improvements in certain areas, such as improving their QA approach, and analyzing the project schedule to identify activities and tasks that are candidates for fast-tracking, in an effort to increase productivity. Additionally, the ASI received approval to restart three workgroups in May. Despite some improvements, IVV maintains this is a high risk to the project as of the May 2019 reporting period, and will continue to monitor productivity improvement efforts. 5/6/19 MF - ASI leadership maintains that the project is progressing as expected and contends that stakeholder perception of lack of productivity is unwarranted.	06/11/19 S Brown: There are a number of concerns nested in this item and the ASI requests they be either separated or documented in a more organized manner. To address the items specifically: 1. The ASI requests the specific detail regarding a JAD session moving from June to December as being due to slippage vs a mutual decision to reprioritize the sequence of the sessions. Given that there is no specific JAD named, the ASI contends that it is likely the latter, and if so, is a sign of collaboration between the ASI and client. 2. as to the concern that the project team's overall lack of experience, the ASI requests specific detail as this is a very high level and broad brush assessment. The ASI requests a measurable and quantifiable metric of this item - 10% of meetings, 30% of meetings or just a couple. 3. the ASI requests clarification and quantification on lack of experience, given that numerous team members have multi project and multi year experience specifically in Integrated Eligibility and complex Systems Integration projects. 4. regarding whether ASI leadership shares the DHS perception of a lack of experience, the ASI has assessed a need for additional training for BA's supporting Kolea. A training schedule has been developed and over 50% of the training sessions have been completed in this reporting period, leveraging the recorded transition sessions and other project artifacts. The ASI requests clarification on whether there is a perception re BA experience in other segments of the team, and would ask for clarity on how change in perception is quantified and measured by IV and V. 5. The ASI directs IV and V to the meeting agendas and associated minutes for the Design Leadership meetings held on a weekly basis for additional documentation of the team's improvement process, as well as the artifacts provided to IV and V in the reporting period. 6. The ASI requests clarification on how IV and V measures a sense of urgency. The ASI and client leadership are holding daily standups, a weekly stand up with the entire team to relay schedule progress, identify and remove barriers, and set expectations on the next week priority actions.	
22	Lack of a dedicated ASI Quality Assurance Team is resulting in extended deliverable reviews	ASI deliverables have consistently exhibited the lack of QA. Poor quality (grammar issues, incomplete sentences, and content issues (duplicative content, missing content, duplicative content, etc.)) has directly caused several unnecessary rounds of deliverable reviews. The ASI's draft PMP states that quality assurance is performed through peer reviews prior to delivery, however there has been no evidence to substantiate that this process is utilized. If it is being utilized, it simply is not meeting the needs of the project.	If the ASI does not properly perform QA, the onus for correction inappropriately falls on the deliverable review team to identify issues that render deliverables as poor and/or unreadable. Poor quality results in additional unplanned ASI rework and unplanned rounds of review for DHS and IVV. Continued unplanned review cycles due to lack of ASI is likely to result in schedule delays.	The ASI should immediately implement a process to improve deliverable readability and quality (examples: for grammar, incomplete sentences, duplicative content, missing content, and conflicting content) prior to delivery to DHS.	Q3 2019	0	0	NA	Retired	7/31/2019	07/31/2019 - Deliverable quality showed improvement on BI-24 and BI-19 during June and July. With a QA Team now in place and deliverable quality improving, IVV is closing this concern. 06/28/2019 - There was an insufficient volume of new ASI deliverables in June by which to re-assess this item. IVV will continue to monitor this concern until more net new ASI deliverables can be validated as having increased in quality. 05/31/2019 - The QA Team made strides in May. The ASI developed and delivered QA Process Improvement training to its staff. Deliverable quality seemed to improve with the delivery of BI-24 in May. Improvement will be monitored and validated as more new deliverables are completed and delivered by the ASI. Other deliverables reviewed in May were re-submissions of deliverables that had already been submitted multiple times. IVV remains concerned that the quality effort is made up solely of PMO staff as opposed to a dedicated quality assurance team. 4/30/2019: Before the end of the month of April, the new PMO Lead was also named as QA Team Lead. IVV will keep this open as a preliminary concern to be further monitored in May.	06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI has provide an additional QA training session to the team. Peer review is required prior to submission for QA. The ASI has added an additional QA resource to the PMO. The ASI requests quantifiable measurement of this item rather than a description of seems to improve. Deliverable review from the client is occurring in the expected timeframe.	
21	The ASI (Unisys) PMO Lead and Data Conversion Lead roles are held by a single staff member, which may cause the Project to suffer due to staff over-allocation and competing priorities.	One ASI staff member holds two positions on the team, including PMO Lead and Data Conversion Lead. Due to the attention required in each of the roles, these two roles are better resourced as individual, full time staff members. This finding is entered as a concern with further observation and discovery to be conducted by IV&V.	If the single staff member holding both positions runs into unexpected challenges for either role, both work streams may end up suffering from lack of resource attention. Both positions and work streams are very important to the success of the project effort.	IVV recommend that the PMO Lead position and the Data Conversion Lead position are both resourced at full time levels.	Q2 2019	2	2	Low	Retired	3/13/2019	3/13/19: Unisys introduced Vic Dudoit as the new PMO Lead for the project. The addition of Mr. Dudoit alleviates the concern, which is now retired.	3/13/19 Bill Thornton, Unisys: ASI agrees with this recommendation and has added an additional full time, dedicated resource for the PMO Lead position.	
20	The Change Request decision process is inordinately slow, which may delay the project schedule	IV&V has observed that the Change Management process, specifically the Change Request decision process, has been inordinately slow, and certainly slower than needed for the project. The same Change Requests have been outstanding for several months, without final approval or denial. These include Lifesay to Adobe, One Siebel Instance, Review Updated RPR Manual, and IDM Migration. This finding is entered as a concern with further observation and discovery to be conducted by IVV.	Change Management is a process that requires some level of expediency. Delays in decisions regarding Change Requests can negatively affect the project schedule.	IV&V recommends that the project determines acceptable durations for each step of the Change Management process, in order to ensure that they are fully evaluated and adjudicated on a predictable and timely basis.	Q2 2019	3	3	Med	Retired	5/31/2019	05/31/2019 - IVV is closing this concern, and opening new related concern # 28. 4/29/2019 - IVV has no material update for the April reporting period. In May, IVV will work with DHS to better understand the CR process and the information being provided by the ASI, and will either substantiate this concern, or close it. 3/26/19: No change. The process is slow for the reasons stated by DHS below. IV&V will continue to monitor this concern and CRs as they come in. 3/6/2019: The DHS PMO noted that the CRs to date have been fairly large, and there have been many questions about the ROM and Project Impact Assessments (PIA) given. The decision process in these situations needs to be deliberate and careful to assure Hawaii funds are expended properly. IV&V will investigate further, and make recommendations for target timeframes or other process improvements.		
19	The lack of an approved, baselined project schedule obscures the ability of stakeholders to accurately measure project progress and/or impacts to the schedule.	Despite on-going efforts to establish project management processes, the project schedule baseline was neither completed by the ASI nor accepted by DHS for the majority of the March reporting period. The ASI has made assertions that delays on some tasks have affected the project timeline, however without a completed baselined schedule, transparency in this regard was obscured. The ASI has been re-structuring and baselining the schedule throughout the month of February, with a goal of delivering the revised, baselined schedule by the end of February. A baselined schedule was not delivered nor approved by the end of February, however, Gary Hirata, DHS BESSD Project Manager reported that a draft project schedule had been shown to him on February 28. In anticipation of a draft project schedule being formally delivered in early March, this finding was initially entered as a concern. When the project schedule was not delivered in early March, this finding was escalated to an issue.	Without a baselined schedule, project team members are unaware when tasks and activities are due to be completed, and it is nearly impossible to fully understand the impact of delayed tasks. Without an realistic, approved baselined project schedule, the project is likely to miss deadlines without knowing the overall impact to the project.	IV&V recommends that the completed Schedule be utilized as both a guide and a communication vehicle on a weekly basis by all project participants, to ensure that all needed tasks and activities are executed in accordance with the detailed dates within the plan, with adherence to the Schedule Management Plan. The Schedule should be used to provide information on what tasks and activities are in-flight, their status, key resources involved, and downstream dependencies, and should be reported out to DHS weekly.	Immediately	5	4	High	Retired	5/31/2019	05/31/2019: All outstanding DCF comments for the BI-05 deliverable have been resolved, and DHS has provided conditional approval of the deliverable on 5/24/19. As such, IVV is closing this finding, however will continue to review and analyze the project schedule for adherence to requirements. IVV has opened three new findings and/or concerns related to the conditionally approved baseline schedule (Rs 26, 27, and 31). IVV is closing this issue as of the May 2019 reporting period. 04/30/2019: The ASI produced two draft revisions of the schedule in April, showing marked improvement from previous months. IVV provided DCF comments to DHS and the ASI, and also provided DHS with a list of priority recommendations for incorporation, to help ensure it is thorough, logical, manageable, and maintainable prior to acceptance. IVV will continue to monitor the progress the ASI makes on developing the project schedule. IVV maintains this is a High risk to the project as of the April 2019 reporting period. 3/26/2019: IV&V has no material update on this issue for this March report. A draft copy of the schedule was presented and delivered on 3/27/19. IV&V would like to review and analyze the schedule before taking any further action on this finding. 3/11/2019: This has been re-prioritized as an issue. The lack of an approved, baselined schedule is currently impeding transparency into schedule impacts due to CRs and other project events. The project schedule was promised to be delivered at the beginning of February, then moved to the end of February, and now in the last half of March. IV&V acknowledges that Unisys is currently working to complete the project schedule.		

Finding Number	Title	Observation	Significance	Recommendation	Event Horizon	Impact	Probability	Analyst Priority	Finding Status	Date Retired	Status Update	Client Comments	Vendor Comments
18	Failure to identify project issues (i.e., follow-up/research activities) may result in the development of the application that does not meet the Project goals, objectives and requirements.	<p>IVV is concerned that there are few issues raised by the project team. IVV understands the Issue Management process was only recently approved and are in the early stages of identifying and managing issues; and that JAD sessions are on hold until the PIP is completed. However, requirement research to include DHS/MQD/BES discussions and research of the KOLEA should continue. In Project meetings, DHS has asked the ASI team to research KOLEA, and BES has offered to assist the ASI on multiple occasions. Issues are a proven method to manage tasks/activities that are in question and work to a common resolution with DHS and the project team. At this phase of the project, it is typical for there to be many issues raised by the project team as requirements are researched and discussed with the users (DHS PMO/BIAS/BES/MQD). This concern requires further observation and discovery by IVV.</p>	The absence of any recorded issues could lead to a situation where the end solution does not meet the business needs or intent of the requirements in some or multiple areas. The sooner issues are identified and resolved by the project team, the less potential for the impact to the project.	<p>5/31/2019 - IVV recommends the decision process (JAD and Project) be updated to include a process to communicate decisions to the project team and validate the DHS PMO and Unisys Leadership team is in agreement with the decisions. One option is to review the decision log during the project status meeting and DHS/Unisys internal team meetings. This will aid in the validation step of the decision and identification of possible downstream or cross-functional impacts of a decision. The DHS and ASI leadership team should encourage the project team to identify and document issues so that they are resolved timely with the appropriate staff. Reinforce the concept that the Issue Management process is positive and healthy for the overall success of the project.</p>	Requirement Phase Concludes	3	5	Med	Retired	6/24/2019	<p>6/24/2019 - DHS and the ASI are actively and consistently updating and maintaining the project issue log, action items in the JAD and Workgroup meeting that have re-started, Project Status issues and action items. The action items and decisions are maintained within SharePoint so that all project team members have access and they are reviewed/updated in the appropriate meetings or project requirement sessions. IVV is closing this issue, due to the improvements noted. 5/31/2019: IVV notes continued improvement in the tracking of action items, issues and decisions during the committee meetings. Currently the JAD calendar is being updated to reflect current dates since the DHS PMO provided Unisys approval for some of the JAD sessions to move forward. On 5/15/2019, IVV noted to Unisys that some of the decisions in the decision log were in a 'in progress' status however, the Decision process for the JAD sessions and Project (Change Management Plan) did not provide the process to close these decisions. Subsequently, Unisys has placed these decisions in a 'closed' status. IVV is concerned that decisions made are (1) not communicated to the project team, and (2) validation of the decisions made by the project team are supported by the projects leadership team and stakeholders, when appropriate. IVV is escalating this to an issue until validation from both DHS PMO and Unisys is received and the process is updated to reflect the validation step. IVV will continue to monitor actions items, decisions, issues and risks. 4/30/2019: IVV notes improvement in the Requirements Committee Sessions in that data is now captured to improve managing action items to include target complete dates and status. IVV notes decisions are now logged in the Project Decision Log however, some are noted with a status of In Progress. IVV will further research and discuss with the project team to determine where the actions are documented to finalize the decisions to avoid confusion with the project team. IVV will keep this concern open until the JAD sessions are reestablished and conducted for a minimum of one month to ensure consistency and execution to the defined process. 03/31/2019: DHS, Unisys and IVV met to review the process to manage action/research items and decisions during the Requirement Workgroup and JAD sessions on 3/25/2019. Action items will be maintained in each of Requirement Workgroup and JAD sessions Meeting Minutes. Decisions will be logged in the Project Decision Log to</p>	06/11/19 5 Brown: The ASI requests a defined timeline of successful delivery of this item that is required for IV and V to close/retire.	
17	The Project may experience the situation where several deliverables may be presented to DHS for review and approval within a short period of time, which may cause schedule delays.	<p>The lack of a deliverable review process, delays occurring in the DED review and approval process and final approved DED's may result in the ASI to submitting multiple deliverables for review/approval at the same time or within a short time frame. Following the early identification of this risk, DHS, ASI and IV&V met to gain a better understanding of revised deliverable schedule. The ASI has not published an updated schedule (as of the end of January), therefore it is unknown at this point when the project deliverables will be available for review.</p>	An unusually high number of deliverables submitted for review in the same general time frame may be more than available State staff are able to process in desired review cycle times. This will in turn cause new delays in approvals of the submitted deliverables; increasing the risk for negative project schedule impact.	<p>Options to mitigate the risk include: * Prioritizing the deliverables to identify those that should be reviewed first based on the criteria of schedule impact and/or cross-deliverable integration; * Review of interim drafts; * Addition of DHS resources to review/approve deliverables; * Addition of DHS review time for the larger deliverables; and/or * Adopt an option of 'conditional' approval with specific criteria that must be met to achieve final approval.</p>	Unknown at this time	4	2	Low	Retired	6/24/2019	<p>6/24/2019 - DHS is committed to and has demonstrated they will review deliverables as quickly as possible. Specifically, in June 2019, three major deliverables were due to have comments returned to the ASI by 6/21/2019, BI-8 Technology Environments Specifications, BI-24 Organizational Change Management and Stakeholder Communication, and Section 1 and 5 of BI-6 DDI plan. All three were completed by the due date. Additionally, the ASI weekly status report includes the status of deliverables in progress providing DHS with advance notice of future required reviews along with progress checks in the weekly project Stand Up meetings. IVV is closing this risk, however, will continue to monitor the flow of deliverables to be reviewed, specifically as functional and technical design documentation is delivered. 5/31/2019 - DHS provided the ASI with conditional approval of the Schedule on May 24, 2019. IVV is in process of reviewing the revised schedule and will provide an update next month to determine if this risk is still valid. IVV maintains this is a low risk as of the May 2019 reporting period. 4/30/2019 - A revised draft of the schedule was published on April 12, 2019 and has still not been approved. IVV plans to review and analyze the revised schedule before taking any action on this finding. The ASI is also working with BES/PMO to identify deliverable review/approval process changes to streamline the process. As many of the up-front deliverables have been approved, IVV dropped the priority of this risk from Medium to Low in the April 2019 reporting period. IVV will continue to monitor this risk. 03/31/2019 - A draft version of the schedule was presented and delivered on 3/27/2019, however IV&V would like to review and analyze the schedule before taking any further action on this finding, and anticipates having a more detailed update in the April report. 02/28/2019 - Progress was made this month in that DHS developed, and the Project Team adopted, a deliverable review and approval process. The ASI has not yet published the revised project schedule. It is noted many of the DED's are now approved, however the downstream impact will not be known until the revised schedule is published. 01/31/2019 - The ASI has not published the revised schedule yet. We will continue to monitor this risk.</p>	06/11/19 5 Brown: Daily and weekly stand up meetings are held to actively and collaboratively manage the schedule.	
16	Lack of clear understanding of SI DDI approach may reduce effectiveness of JARs and JADs	<p>Several DHS stakeholders have commented that the SI Design, Development, and Implementation (DDI) approach is unclear. While stakeholders can observe SI activity and have participated in some SI activities, they do not understand how it all fits together and some activity objectives seem unclear. The SI conducted a DDI approach overview session during an Initial JAR session, however not all stakeholders were present. IVV did not locate any DDI approach documentation or materials that could be referenced by stakeholders who may have missed to the overview session, by new members of the team, or by other interested parties.</p>	Lack of stakeholder understanding and buy-in to the SI DDI approach and project activity objectives may reduce the effectiveness of JAR and JAD sessions as well as other BES project activities and decisions.	<p>PCG recommends one or more of the following to mitigate this risk: * SI provide an additional DDI approach overview session for stakeholders and allow for Q&A * SI provide DDI approach documentation/materials for stakeholders to review and/or refresh their knowledge on demand; the materials could be made available via the project SharePoint * SI submit DDI Plan deliverable and make it easily available to all project stakeholders</p>	1/31/19	4	3	Med	Open		<p>9/30/19 - IVV reported last month that ASI 'big picture' documentation and presentation fell short of expectations. IVV remains unaware of ASI efforts to provide further information to clarify for DHS the 'big picture' as described in previous updates to this finding. Relatedly, DHS expressed concern that design documents (BI 10, 11, 14) are being modified after test and RTM documents (BI 20, 21) have been released, which could impact the content of both BI 20 and BI 2. The ASI has described their approach for managing cross-JAD interactions through action items and have tasked the lead BA's with managing this as well as identifying/resolving cross-team items. IVV notes that this finding was originally opened over 9 months ago (12/17/2018) and DHS continues to struggle to understand both the ASI DDI approach and whether the approach taken has been or will be effective. Due to this prolonged lack of clarity, IVV is escalating this finding to an issue. 8/29/19 - The ASI presented their 'big picture' documentation to DHS on 8/23/19, intending to clarify how design documents (UC/FDD/TDD) from various JAD's would come together and effectively address interactions between the different functional areas. However, the documents/presentation did not meet DHS expectations, and additional detail and clarification has been requested by DHS. IVV has opened a related risk (#836) that addresses the risks around the lack of clarity around the process for ensuring cross-JAD Action Items are sent and received by the appropriate analysts. This remains an open project action item for the Unisys team. The impact of this risk is still being determined, however without immediate reconciliation, this could have a significant impact on system design. IVV maintains this is a medium risk as of the August reporting period. 8/21/19 - Action item for Unisys to clarify their approach is now past due as of 8/14/19. 7/31/19 - There is a lack of clarity amongst DHS and IVV regarding Unisys' design approach as it relates to the development of use cases and functional design documents (FDD), and the 'big picture' of how they fit together. As a result, the project logged action item (#473) on 7/10/2019, titled 'DHS wants to know how design Use Cases/ FDDs are being put together for a comprehensive view of this information'. The 7/31/2019 Project status report, slide 7, shows an in-progress activity, 'Work on process to show the big picture'. 6/26/19 - ASI efforts to provide packets/templates and other information before JAD and</p>	<p>1/3/19 - Unisys (Bill Thornton) reports that they offered to provide the approach materials in the pre-JAD package and conduct an overview prior to each JAD session, however, DHS has declined this offer. 06/11/19 5 Brown: The ASI disagrees with this finding and associated rating. The DDI plan has been presented to the client in its entirety and the ASI is executing delivery as detailed in the plan. In addition, there have been numerous presentations and discussions on the methodology to the client. The ASI is in the process of updating the deliverable based on the DCF comments, with many of them from IV and that have been very high level and needed clarification on how the comments apply to the specifics of this project. There are two remaining sections along with general comments still due to the client this week. Walkthroughs will be scheduled as needed. 09/12/19 5B: The BI 6 DDI Plan Deliverable has been accepted by DHS. The ASI is currently addressing comments on the iterations of BI 10 Functional Design deliverable provided for review to DHS to more clearly align with sections of the approved DED. 10/10/19 5B: DHS has agreed to the updated BI 10 template which will be reviewed as part of Iteration 3 artifacts. In addition, the ASI has produced a literal big picture and walked DHS and the PMO through it. The whiteboard big picture is being produced for team consumption.</p>	

Finding Number	Title	Observation	Significance	Recommendation	Event Horizon	Impact	Probability	Analyst Priority	Finding Status	Date Retired	Status Update	Client Comments	Vendor Comments
15	The Decision Log lacks data elements needed for tracking and reporting on key Project Decisions, which may hamper discovery of decisions.	The SharePoint Decision Log requires additional data elements for tracking and reporting on Decisions such as: Decision Types, Decision Sub-Categories, etc.	If material data about the decision is not tracked and recorded, the Project may miss opportunities to benefit from trends in key decisions. Additionally, inadequate data capture may hamper reporting on decisions and ultimately obscure discovery of key decisions by project team members.	DHS, the ASI, and IV&V meet to determine all elements needed to support the Decision Log and associated processes. Following that activity, IV&V recommends that the DHS SharePoint Decisions log is updated to reflect all agreed-to-needed elements and decisions.	First Key Decision	3	3	Low	Retired	5/31/2019	05/31/2019 - 5/31/2019: As the data elements have been determined to meet the needs of the project, IVV is closing this finding. However, IVV maintains that related finding #14 and new finding #25 are valid and remain open as they focus more on the project's decision making process and execution. IVV is closing this risk as of the May 2019 reporting period. 04/28/2019 - The ASI and DHS have come to agreement as to how the log will be utilized. Nested directories will be utilized in the SharePoint Decision Log. IVV will continue to monitor this risk in May to ensure that the SharePoint Decision Log data elements mirror the needs of the revised Decision Management process. IV&V maintains this is a Low risk to the project in the April 2019 reporting period. 03/26/2019. IV&V has no material update to this risk. Review of the third draft of the PMP is complete, however the Decision Log data elements were still not included. IV&V is adding a comment to the PMP document DCF to bring attention to this item, and anticipates having additional information in the April report. 02/28/2019: No Change. Review of the second draft of the PMP is complete, however Decision Log elements were not present in the second draft of the PMP. 01/29/19: No change. Review of the draft PMP is underway, however Decision Log elements were not found in the initial review of the PMP. 12/31/18: No change. The necessary data elements for the Decision Log have not yet been finalized by the ASI or PMO. It is assumed that this may be documented in the Project Management Plan, which has not yet been delivered to DHS. 12/6/18: Rated Low by the analyst due to only one Decision in play at this point in time.		
14	The Decision Log process is undefined, which may hamper communication and discovery of Project Decisions.	The process by which key project decisions should be added to the Decision Log is undefined and unclear. While it is not realistic to add each and every detailed project decision to a Decision Log, parameters need to be determined and documented that clearly indicate which decisions should be added to the log versus which decisions should not be added to the log.	If guidance is undefined/unclear on how the Decision Log will be utilized, it is highly likely that the log's purpose will not be met. Decisions at a too-detailed level will "clutter" the log, and decisions at a too-broad level will cause decisions to be remain undiscovered, both of which will cause team members to be unaware of such decisions. The impact of both may cause rework in the project, which could lead to project delays and diminish project quality.	IV&V recommends that DHS, the ASI, and IV&V meet to determine the parameters that will be used to identify the level and types of decisions that will be entered in the log. This information should then be recorded in the Project Management Plan, Communications Plan, or other appropriate document/artifact.	First Key Decision	4	4	Med	Retired	6/24/2019	06/24/2019 - Since the Decision Management process was agreed to by the ASI and DHS, and documented within the Project's Change Management Plan, this finding is being closed by IVV. Please see related finding #32 specific to the Decision Process execution. 05/31/2019 - While agreement on the decision log process was reached in May, IVV observed that execution of the process is inefficient, preventing the project from benefitting from a clear decision-logging and communication process. Specific observations are provided below: There are very few 'project-level' decisions recorded in the Decision Log; most Decision entries are ADMA Workgroup-related, or have been carried over from workgroups and shared services. There is inconsistent use of fields provided on the log. 15 of the total 18 Decision entries are missing one or more of the following important fields: Decision Date, Decision Comments, Impact of Decision, Alternatives Considered, and/or Links to Supplemental Documents. The 'Impact of Decision' field is completed as 'Other' for most Decision entries, obscuring access to important historical data. On the positive side, the ASI modified the Decision Log in late May log to allow for recording outstanding (not yet made) decisions. This will assist in ensuring that outstanding decisions can be prioritized and made in a more expedient manner. This finding is closely related to new finding #25. IVV maintains this is a medium risk as of the May 2019 reporting period. 04/28/2019 - The ASI and DHS have come to agreement for the process to be used for Decision Management. Nested directories will be utilized in the SharePoint Decision Log to differentiate the varying levels of decisions attained for the project. IVV will continue to monitor this risk in the May to ensure that the revised approach and new process is successful, repeatable, and meets the Decision Management needs of the project. IV&V maintains this is a Low risk to the project in the April 2019 reporting period. 03/26/2019. IV&V has no material update to this risk. Review of the third draft of the PMP is complete, however the Decision Log parameters were still not included. IV&V is adding a comment to the PMP document DCF to bring attention to this item, and anticipates having additional information in the April report. 02/28/2019: Review of the second draft of the PMP is complete, however, the Decision Log process was not present in the second draft of the PMP. 01/29/19: No change. Review of the draft PMP is 9/30/19 - IVV is closing this issue as of the September report as the ETS PAC has reviewed and approved the Contract Amendment to reimburse the ASI for the cloud environments. IVV will continue to monitor the impacts that the contract amendment and the provisioning of the cloud environments may have on the project. 8/29/19 - Due to security issues related to remote access by the ASI offshore staff, the ASI has created the following cloud environments which DHS will reimburse for: 3 dev, 1 testing, 1 training. A contract amendment for the reimbursement has been drafted and is awaiting approval. The following environments will be on premise - UAT, staging, production. As the impact of this risk has been realized and accepted by DHS, resulting in drafting a contract amendment, IVV is escalating this to an Issue until the contract amendment is executed. Additionally, the issuance of the contract amendment and the implications it has on DDI, security, and migrating between cloud and on-prem will be tracked separately by IVV. See related findings, #29 and #12. IVV maintains this is a medium priority as of the August 2019 reporting period. 7/29/19 - The project has closed out a similar project risk 'Differing expectations between ASI/ESI' as they feel the differences have been clarified. DHS logged decision #96 in the project decision log stating that in order for Unisys to move forward with offshore development work, they should provision cloud environments and DHS will reimburse them for the work. IVV acknowledges the decision and the agreement between the parties; however, will continue to track this risk until the impacts to project budget and schedule are known. 6/27/19 - Documented environment plans have yet to be shared with IVV. IVV is unaware if ESI responsibilities and contractual obligations upon implementation of the new environment plan have been fully resolved. Until IVV has the opportunity to review this documentation, this remains a medium risk to the project. The ASI has stated that there is no difference between ASI and ESI expectations as the ASI BAFO and contract clearly states 10 environments. 5/31/19 - DHS has indicated that the ASI has provided them with a revised environment plan, however, this revised plan has not been shared with IVV, and nothing was entered into the Decision Log in relation to this topic in May. IVV maintains this is a medium risk as of the May 2019 reporting period. 4/29/19 - The ASI has indicated that their	06/11/19 5 Brown: The ASI disagrees with the rating of this item. We request quantifiable and measurable criteria be provided that rates a maturation of a process such as the use of the decision log as a high impact risk. The ASI notes that the IV and I is not documenting that decisions are not being made at the project level, but the process of recording them is a risk. The ASI provided updated documentation on the agreed to decision log process as part of the PMP in the reporting period.	
13	Differing ASI and ESI expectations regarding DDI environments may impact project schedule and cost	The ASI has requested development environments to support BES DDI that the existing on premise infrastructure may not support. There is discussion that the underlying challenge relates solely to the number of environments, in fact, the ASI is not requesting more environments than specified in their BAFO. The ASI is requesting development environments for the BES Project that are aligned with the platform and application software upon which the BES solution will reside in production. It is IV&V understanding that the existing KOLEA development environments have not been kept up to date (e.g., tool and operating system patches and updates) and that a concerted effort to bring those environments current would be necessary if the ASI could use the KOLEA environments. However, since the BES solution is planned to be implemented on a higher version (version 17) of Siebel than KOLEA uses (version 15), the ASI cannot use existing KOLEA environments even if those environments were up to date for their platform version(s). The Project requires development environments that align with the future production environment and platform. The cost impact of acquiring suitable development environments could be substantial. The Project is tracking this and has rated the ESI and Platform items as Yellow in the most current status report; nevertheless, IV&V considers this risk to be Red due to the level of complexity and potential cost and schedule impacts.	If the ASI is constrained by having to develop the BES solution in the existing KOLEA development environments (regardless whether those environments are up to date), the quality of the BES solution may be negatively affected. The BES solution could not be fully tested on a production-like platform prior to roll-out or go-live. Nuances between Siebel versions, among other supporting software versions, between development and production can cause unexpected defects ranging from catastrophic to annoying. Creating suitable development environments for BES is a task that, from all appearances, was not anticipated by the ESI or DHS. Contract details notwithstanding, creation of new or re-purposed environments is complex and will require time and effort from DHS, the ESI, and the ASI. The contract details, particularly around the responsibility for the cost of creating BES development environments, and potential increased licensing fees may ultimately result in increased costs to DHS. Both of these impacts may subsequently cause delay to the BES project schedule.	• ASI work with the State to reach a common understanding of the requirements for the BES DDI environments. • ESI and ASI work together to formulate an environment strategy that will meet the project platform and development needs and minimize impact to the State.	Q1 2019	3	3	Med	Retired	9/30/2019	1/4/2019, Doug Murdoch, CIO - ETS: DHS is aware of the environments issue and we are working with Oracle, Unisys and BIAS to find a resolution. BIAS and Unisys have indicated a need for more environments than expected and we have a disagreement about exactly what the contracts require or allow. We had a big meeting at Unisys to discuss the problem and BIAS and Unisys have submitted preliminary solutions. Both solutions involve setting up BES environments on the cloud and they require additional funding. I plan to meet with both next week and I have a meeting with Oracle on Thursday to discuss price of cloud capacity. We recently signed the year 2 extension for BIAS and there is a priced option for them to build the environments. I would also note that Unisys has a deliverable for their environments plan that we have not received yet, so I believe requests for environments without an approved plan is premature.	09/12/19 5B: The ASI is working closely with DHS as these environments are built out. 06/11/19 5 Brown: The ASI has provisioned four Oracle cloud environments to reduce impact to the schedule and project. The ASI has statuses progress of these build outs as part of the weekly status report and meeting. The ASI has worked with the ESI to develop and support a POC of lift and shift capability of the existing KOLEA environments to the cloud. The client has escalated issues to the ESI in a timely manner. -ASI has submitted a proposed solution for the environment issue – not a no-cost CR. 3/13/19 Bill Thornton, Unisys: 2/6/19, Bill Thornton, Unisys: Findings and Recommendations (#13) – Configuration and Development DEV environment—This issue was entered into the risk register on December 5th not 1/30 as implied in this risk write-up. 12/6/18, Keith Stock, Unisys: 13) The comment that the ASI vendor is requesting "additional environments" is misleading. The ASI vendor is requesting the number of environments as described in our proposal and subsequent contract. The recommendation that the ESI and ASI vendors work together to come up with an environment strategy that "will not incur additional cost to the State" may not be possible – recommend the recommendation be that a strategy be identified that minimizes additional cost to the State.	

Finding Number	Title	Observation	Significance	Recommendation	Event Horizon	Impact	Probability	Analyst Priority	Finding Status	Date Retired	Status Update	Client Comments	Vendor Comments
12	Changes in direction regarding the preferred platform for portal development may impact project schedule and cost. [LifeRay vs. Adobe]	The project intends to utilize Adobe as the preferred platform for portal development, instead of LifeRay (which is currently used for the existing KOLEA portal platform), as the BES project web portal solution. Adobe Forms is currently out of scope for the BES portal but is in scope for BES PDF production. This decision represents a change in scope and requires a CR, which is currently in process. ASI has given DHS a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) estimate of \$2.8 million for this CR and has also provided a more details PIA. As of the date of this report, the Project is tracking this as a 'Top Level Issue.' It is unclear if DHS will be able to fund this CR or if it will involve de-scoping/scope swaps.	If DHS executes a change request to implement Adobe as the BES portal solution, there will be a significant impact to the project budget. The ASI has stated that if the portal platform is not decided soon there will be schedule impacts as they need to staff for the appropriate skillset. ASI has also stated they may begin developing a solution in LifeRay until a CR is executed to move to Adobe.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DHS request more details from the ASI to better understand the details around such a high cost to move to an Adobe-based BES portal solution. DHS request more details from the ASI to better understand the ASI's urgency to begin portal development now instead of focusing on other areas of design and development. 	Q1 2019	4	3	Med	Open		<p>9/30/19 - IVV has no material update for this finding as the updated CR for portal is still outstanding. Concern continues to grow as the project has been in limbo regarding the direction of the portal for approximately six months. It is currently unclear if this delay or its impact to the critical path has been accurately reflected in the schedule or if the ASI had already allotted time for the delay in their original schedule. Given these delays and the fact that deliverables have already been produced assuming a LifeRay platform, IVV is escalating this finding to an issue.</p> <p>8/29/19 - There is unclear communication between DHS and ASI regarding the portal. After the project was initiated, DHS informed Unisys that the Department decided to standardize on Adobe Sites and Forms and requested Unisys change its portal development including KOLEA from LifeRay to Adobe. Because the decision was different than Unisys' proposal, Unisys submitted a CR and proposed hours for the change. Due to the high cost, DHS decided to competitively bid the portal work for KOLEA and to turn over the new portal to be used for BES. Later, in discussions between DHS and Unisys, Unisys offered to convert only the KOLEA portal to Adobe to validate the risks identified in the original CR. When a new CR was not prepared, DHS prepared the CR for submittal. The CR was not submitted because the ASI engagement manager indicated other discussions were underway. Unisys now understands DHS' decision is firm on Adobe and is re-evaluating the hours and associated cost of the initial CR. A revised CR is expected in two weeks. In the meantime, DHS has prepared an RFP to convert the KOLEA portal (which will be expanded to accommodate the BES functionalities). IVV maintains this is a Medium severity risk to the project as of the August reporting period, as the portal development timeframe and the project budget is likely to be impacted by the move to Adobe.</p> <p>8/21/19 - DHS leadership has recently decided the Adobe will be the BES project portal platform, not LifeRay. 7/31/19 - IVV has no update on this finding, but maintains this is a low risk as of the July 2019 reporting period. 6/27/19 - The ASI has reported they are working to update the Adobe change request (CR) that includes migrating the KOLEA portal from LifeRay to Adobe at no additional cost to DHS and will likely seek approval at the next CCB meeting. IVV will continue to monitor this finding until the CR is published and IVV can review. 5/22/19: DHS and ASI negotiation with regard to this change request</p>	03/13/2019 Bill Thornton, Unisys: Clarification has been provided to the composite rate applying to DDI enhancements with the existing technology stack. Adobe is a new technology and the composite rate does not apply. We will update the PIA with effort and the roles utilized. 06/11/19 S. Brown: The ASI disagrees with the finding that there is limited communication to the project on this item. It is statused on a weekly basis as part of the status report and meeting, with client agreement on status. 09/12/19 SB: Active conversation and assessment of options continues between the ASI and DHS. 10/10/19 SB: The ASI would like the IV and V to update their assessment to include the status that there have been multiple iterations of this CR that have been provided to DHS to address their project needs and budget concerns. The ASI has provided the PMO with an updated approach and ROM for the conversion of the KOLEA portal to Adobe that the ASI believes is in line with DHS expectations and it is currently under review by DHS.	
11	Changes in direction regarding the preferred business intelligence (BI)/reporting tool may impact project schedule and cost. [Cognos vs. OBIEE]	The project intends to utilize OBIEE, instead of Cognos, for the BES project business intelligence (BI)/reporting solution. The Change Request (CR) for this change to the original contract has been drafted and is currently under review. Unclear if DHS will be able to fund this CR or if it will involve de-scoping/scope swaps.	IV&V has insufficient information to fully analyze the impact(s) on this project, thus a low criticality rating has been assigned until such analysis can be performed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete the CR process to obtain a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) estimate and/or impact analysis as appropriate 	Q1 2019	3	4	Low	Retired	2/28/2019	<p>3/27/19 - No change. 2/28/19 - ASI has stated the move to OBIEE will incur no additional cost to DHS and will submit a no cost CR. 1/31/19 - No progress.12/31/18: A draft CR was initiated by DHS but has not yet been provided to Unisys to start the change management process. The draft CR contains no stated impacts to the schedule, project cost, or platform costs (e.g., licensing, et al). This low criticality risk remains open pending completion of the CR process.</p>		
10	The number of instances of Siebel to be implemented for BES Project is undecided, which may impact the project schedule and project costs.	Discussions are ongoing regarding the need for single vs. dual instances of Siebel to support the ability to share data between MCD and BESSD. Although the ASI's BAFO proposed dual instances and the ASI has indicated the need to memorialize this in the project Decision Log, DHS has expressed an interest in a single instance. This scope change could introduce a significant cost/schedule impact to the project. The ASI is currently tracking this as a high risk to the project and has indicated this could incur a 1 year delay. Details of moving to a single instance have yet to be resolved. Such a move would be out of scope of the existing contract. The decision on one versus two instances of Siebel could have negative impact to scope, cost and schedule.	<p>This scope change could introduce a significant cost/schedule impact to the project. A decision to move forward with one versus two Siebel instances could result in additional project costs and schedule delay, and would likely be a significant effort that is out of scope of the existing contract.</p> <p>if the decision is delayed, the vision of data sharing between the departments could be compromised. The sooner this decision is finalized, the better the chances for successful mitigation in the best interest of the project.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work collaboratively (DHS, ASI and ESI) to develop a long term infrastructure strategy along with 5+ year ROI, cost/benefit, license strategy, and risk proposition that includes an assessment of a single vs. dual instance assessment. 2. Record the decision in the Decision Log – even if the decision remains within project scope – to memorialize the outcome and alleviate the impact of the topic resurfacing later. 	Q1 2019	4	4	High	Retired	5/31/2019	<p>5/22/19 MF - Indications are that the ASI will utilize two Siebel instances going forward, with an understanding that moving to a single instance will happen after go-live. While it appears that there is agreement on this between DHS and the ASI, there is no formally documented decision, nor is there any detail on how this decision will impact the project both now and going forward. IVV is retiring this risk given that the decision appears to have been made, however is opening a new risk (#29) specific to the decision-making process and communication regarding architecture decisions such as this one. IVV is closing this risk as of the May 2019 reporting period. 4/29/19 - The ASI has indicated that their original architecture strategy may change, however, internal discussions are underway regarding these potential changes. These changes could significantly impact ESI and ASI responsibilities and ultimately impact the project budget. IVV recommends DHS request the ASI work quickly to solidify and vet this plan with the appropriate stakeholders as well as determine schedule and budget impacts. ASI has indicated that DHS intends to defer merging to a single instance post BES DDI. IVV will seek to validate and gather more information on this decision. IVV maintains this is a High risk to the project as of the April 2019 reporting period. 3/27/19 - IV&V has no material update to this risk and is not aware if the planned working session between the ASI and DHS was held, or, if additional information on the ROM has been provided to DHS. 2/28/19 - DHS has initiated a CR in order to better understand the associated costs of the single instance. This risk remains open with high criticality due to increasingly high potential for rework the longer the decision is pending. 1/31/18 - ASI has provided DHS with Use cases which DHS has reviewed. DHS to determine if a CR will be submitted to develop ROM pricing and schedule impacts for a single instance. 12/31/18: DHS PMO is developing use cases that will describe the DHS business need (i.e., the overarching need for all of DHS vs only BESSD), and intends to discuss the business need for a single instance with Unisys in January to help bring about an understanding of the importance and urgency. This risk remains high due to increasingly high potential for rework the longer a decision is pending.12/6/18: The language about a CR caused the finding to be a bit misleading and we have removed the language. Our intent was simply to state that we cannot yet fully</p>	12/6/18, Keith Stock, Unisys:10 We agree that this "decision" needs to be finalized and memorialized. However, we are unclear as to how a potential change request (i.e. potentially changing from the proposed dual instance approach to a single instance) is a high risk to the project. It would be a change. If a change is requested, the change would go through the Change Request process where DHS could assess the impact of cost, time, etc. and determine to move forward or not. In other words, if we do nothing, no issue, we are moving forward as proposed.... no risk. If they decide to change, they will do so via the CR process with all available information and schedules and costs would be adjusted accordingly.	

Finding Number	Title	Observation	Significance	Recommendation	Event Horizon	Impact	Probability	Analyst Priority	Finding Status	Date Retired	Status Update	Client Comments	Vendor Comments
9	BESSD leads and/or teams have not been assigned to the Project, which negatively impact the schedule and workload.	IV&V has observed that DHS has not designated specific individuals to serve as BESSD leads to support the project. In addition, although the SharePoint site for the project indicates that BESSD teams have been envisaged for BI and Reporting, Data Conversion, Functional, Organizational Change Management, Project Management, Security Technical, Testing and Training, team members have not been identified.	Without committing dedicated BESSD resources to the project, the schedule is at risk as project demands (e.g., meeting attendance, document review) and workloads increase. For a project of this size and significance, the involvement of subject matter experts to ensure that the solution is designed to meet the business needs is critical.	*Identify high-priority areas where BESSD Leads are needed and obtain executive level support to reallocate BESSD staff to the project soon as possible. Re-assess the need for support throughout the project life cycle to ensure that the appropriate subject matter experts are available as required.	January 2019	3	3	Med	Retired	5/31/2019	5/31/19 IV&V remains concerned that there are communication and logistics obstacles between DHS leads and Unisys leads with regards to planning and preparing for JADs/workgroups, and other project working sessions. However, IV&V is closing this risk as BESSD has assigned the necessary leads to the project. IVV is closing this risk as of the May 2019 reporting period. 5/22/19 MF - DHS has requested the ASI involve DHS leads in preparations for meetings they co-lead with the ASI, however, this does not seem to be happening. Due to this, there is increased risk that ASI co-leads do not have the appropriate input to prepare for these joint meetings, which could impact their value and effectiveness. 4/29/19 - DHS has indicated that their newly hired Business Analyst will be responsible for assisting with updating/reviewing the RTM. DHS/ASI are currently leveraging weekly meetings (Thursdays) to collaborate on JAD session templates. While DHS leads may be in place and each workgroup has been assigned a DHS and ASI co-lead, it is unclear if the co-leads are effectively communicating and/or collaborating. For example, DHS has indicated that the ASI may not be collaborating with DHS leads to develop workgroup session agendas. This could lead to session content that is unexpected or not well thought through, and ultimately result in project team frustration. IVV maintains that this is a Medium risk to the project for the April 2019 reporting period. 3/27/19 - DHS has hired a project management assistant and business analyst, but IV&V is not aware of the details of their roles or responsibilities. IV&V will continue to monitor this risk and will provide updates in the April as more details of roles and responsibilities are learned. 2/28/19: JAD sessions remain on hold. 1/31/19: JAD sessions were placed on hold in January. This risk remain open pending resumption of JAD sessions and observation of the results of the BES staffing assignments made in late December. 12/31/18: The DHS Project Manager (PM) provided Unisys with the staffing assignments for deliverable reviews on 12/31/18. Further, the DHS PM advised IV&V that DHS BESSD has defined roles and assigned Lead responsibilities for JADs to their project staff, and an escalation process has been defined. This information was announced the week of December 31st. This risk remains open - downgraded to a Medium criticality - pending observation of results of these actions.	06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI asks the IV and V to quantify their finding of insufficient utilization, rather than just the broad comment of appears to continue. A DHS lead has been engaged with their ASI counterpart in all of the current workgroups and JAD planning. In this reporting period, packets were being provided on time for DHS review of content and determination of appropriate attendees. Agendas are provided for client review to ensure content is properly defined and any adjustments to attendees be made. As noted in the comments above, we are jointly meeting for a daily standup to assess progress, identify issues and assess opportunities for schedule pull in. Work sessions have been held with a larger team audience to review the schedule and will continue each week.	
8	The SharePoint Decision Log is not being used to record project decisions, which will hamper communications and cause decisions to be revisited	The SharePoint Decisions Log is not being used to record and track project decisions, and it requires additional data elements for tracking and reporting on Decisions such as: Decision Types, Decision Sub-Categories, etc.	If Project Decisions are not recorded on a central repository (such as the SharePoint Log developed for this purpose), communications based on Project Decisions are likely to become hampered, and decisions will need to be revisited multiple times.	IV&V recommends that DHS, the ASI, and IV&V meet to determine all elements needed to support the Decision Log and associated processes, and that the project institutionalizes the process. Following that activity, IV&V recommends that the DHS SharePoint Decisions log is updated to reflect all agreed-to needed elements and decisions.	January 2019	3	3	Med	Retired	12/6/2018	12/06/2018: Per the ASI, there are no Decisions to enter into the Decisions Log. This is confirmed with DHS BES. Based on this correction of fact, IV&V will retire this finding, and will open up new findings to address the separate topics of the lack of a documented decision making process and the need for additional data elements in the Decision Log.	12/4/18, Tracey Laride: Key Finding #8, p. 13. Is the IV&V recommending DD&BESSD decisions (requirements, design, etc.) be logged here or BES Scope (Change Management) decisions be logged here or both?	12/6/18, Keith Stock, Unisys: 8). It is being used there just are not any decisions yet to log
7	The Change Management Process is not fully documented and approved, which could delay Change Requests and affect scope, schedule, cost, and quality.	The Change Management Process is not yet documented and approved. All three (3) risks currently tracked in the SharePoint Risk and Issues log indicate the potential need for a formalized Change Management process.	If the Change Management process is not developed and instituted, there is a high likelihood that needed Change Requests could be delayed, which could negatively affect scope, schedule, cost, and quality.	IVV recommends that the ASI complete development of the Change Management Plan, and collaborate with DHS to ensure the process is institutionalized for the BES Project.	January 2019	3	2	Med	Retired	4/28/2019	04/28/2019 - As of the end of April, there are no longer open DCF comments on this PMP sub-plan, effectively providing acceptance of this sub-plan. IVV is closing this risk, however will monitor the project's change management activity throughout the life of the project. 03/26/2019: The ASI updated the Change Management Plan as a component of the third draft of the PMP. After incorporation of final comments, IV&V anticipates this finding should be ready for closure in the April reporting period. 02/28/2019: The ASI updated the Change Management Plan as component of the second draft of the PMP. There remain some outstanding comments to be addressed by the ASI, however, the Change Management Plan is now closer to meeting stakeholder expectations. The risk remains at a Medium priority pending finalization and approval of the plan. 01/29/19 - The ASI updated the Change Management Plan sub component of the PMP, and delivered it as a draft. IV&V is in process of review and assessment of all PMP sub plans. 12/31/18: IV&V reviewed the Change Management Plan artifact, and provided assessment comments to DHS and the ASI for resolution. The risk remains open at a Medium criticality pending finalization of the Plan. 12/6/18: IV&V was provided a copy of the Change Management artifact in early December. IV&V will review the document during December and update this finding accordingly.	12/4/18, Tracey Laride: Key Finding #7, p.12. The Change Management process is documented and is in the review process with DHS.	
6	The BES Risk and Issues Log lacks necessary data elements, which are needed to afford complete transparency.	IV&V has observed that the current Risk and Issues log on SharePoint lacks certain necessary data elements to effectively mitigate risks and contain issues. These elements include Risk Exposure, Required Mitigation / Closure Timeframe or Date, Mitigation Steps, and Updates to Mitigation Steps. It should be noted that the current Risk and Issues Log was provided by DHS and is in the default DHS Risk and Issues format.	Complete documentation of risk and issues is critical to mitigate risks on current projects and prevent similar issues on future projects. Without the integration of effective risk and issue tracking with project status reporting, complete transparency is not afforded and the ability to mitigate risk is diminished.	Meet (DHS, ASI, IV&V) to determine all elements needed to support the Risk and Issue Management processes. Following that activity, update the Risk and Issues log to reflect all agreed-upon elements.	February 2019	3	2	Med	Retired	2/28/2019	02/28/2019 - IVV has reviewed the Excel workbook to determine if all needed elements for tracking have been included. The date of last update was missing, and has since been corrected by the ASI. IVV recommends retiring this finding. 01/31/2019 - Late in the month (1/29), the Project decided to abandon the SharePoint log in favor of an Excel workbook developed by the ASI. IVV will review and assess the new workbook in early February to determine if all needed elements for risk and issue tracking have been included. 12/31/18: The planned meeting to review, discuss, and tailor the Risk and Issues Log was not held in December, but is anticipated to be held in early January. 12/06/2018: IVV recognizes that the SharePoint Log was provided by DHS. A meeting to review, discuss, and tailor the log to meet the needs of the BES Project is expected to take place during December.	12/4/18, Tracey Laride: Key Finding #6, p.12. Is the "Risk Exposure" the same as the Severity or Probability fields on SharePoint? If not, then can you clarify what "Risk Exposure" is? I think "Mitigation Steps" may be the same as Recommendation(s) in the log? If yes, the title can be changed to Mitigation Steps. For the "Updates to Mitigation Steps", it is entered with a date of the update into the comments section of the logged item. If needed, the field title can be changed.	12/6/18, Keith Stock, Unisys:6) The risk and issue log has been provided as a default to all DHS projects along with instructions. DHS PMO has asked for clarification from IV and V and will likely agree to add additional fields

Finding Number	Title	Observation	Significance	Recommendation	Event Horizon	Impact	Probability	Analyst Priority	Finding Status	Date Retired	Status Update	Client Comments	Vendor Comments
5	The Project Partnership Understanding (PPU) for the BES Project has not been approved by CMS, which may impact the project schedule and funding.	The CMS Project Partnership Understanding (PPU) is not finalized between the State and CMS for this project. If funding is expected from CMS, they may require alignment to the MITA Framework, Gate Reviews and/or use of the Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Toolkit (MEET) Checklists. The MEET checklists are developed prior to the CMS gate reviews and are part of the Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Life Cycle (MEELC) that defines the CMS processes for Eligibility and Enrollment projects.	If the PPU is not finalized prior to the State's approval of the functional and technical requirements, the projects Federal funding may be at risk.	The State and CMS complete the PPU and the project incorporate all Federal reporting and process requirements into the appropriate project deliverables.	Prior to Functional and Technical Requirement Approval.	5	1	Low	Open		9/30/2019 - IVV has no material update for the September reporting period, however IVV will continue to work with the project to understand status and the road forward. 8/31/2019 - IVV has no material update for the August reporting period. There is a lack of visibility regarding the MEET checklists for the initial set of KOLEA functionality planned to be implemented in October 2019. Specifically IVV has not received confirmation via project artifacts that the requirements are managed, tracked and validated through all testing phases in ALM from the requirements validation phase through post implementation. IVV maintains this is a low project risk to the project as of the August 2019 reporting period. 7/31/2019 - The project's Action Item Number 190 was closed and this activity is being reported within the ASI's weekly project status report. The ASI is working on the draft MEET checklists for DHS review. 6/26/2019 - No change; the Project Team logged Action Item Number 190 which documents the action for Unisys to review the MEET Checklists and draft a list of those MEET Criteria that apply and then review with DHS. The action item is in the status of "in progress" with the next step due date of 06/28/2019 for Unisys to provide the date they will be ready to review the MEET Checklist Criteria with DHS. IVV maintains this is a low project risk for the June 2019 reporting period. 5/31/2019 - The Unisys project team is moving forward identifying the MEET requirements that may apply for this project. However, CMS has not provided written guidance regarding the approach or applicability of the MEET requirements for this project. Without clarity from CMS, IVV fully supports Unisys' and DHS' approach to align the project's requirements to the MEET criteria now. This may significantly reduce the resource needs to do this as the project progresses through the SOLC, if CMS does require the use of the MEET Checklists. IVV maintains this is a low project risk for the May 2019 reporting period. 4/30/2019 - CMS indicated to the BES/PMO this month that the MEET Checklists may be optional. IVV will keep this risk open until there is clarity from the BES/PMO regarding the identification of any CMS requirements to secure the funding for the KOLEA Enhancements. The priority of this risk was changed to low in the April 2019 reporting period, based on this information from CMS. 3/31/2019 - As the PPU has not been approved, and the CMS reorganization is still underway, IVV has no update to this risk. 2/28/2019 - DHS		
4	An unclear deliverable review and acceptance process may be contributing to project delays.	Project processes for delivering, noticing and reviewing project deliverables are unclear. In order to identify whether a deliverable is available for review, the IV&V team must review the project schedule and check for deliverable postings to SharePoint. While the ASI may be submitting deliverables to the BES Project Manager, neither the IV&V team nor the PMO are notified. As a result, review cycle-times may be missed and deliverable acceptance can be delayed, which may inhibit the ASI's ability to move forward on future tasks.	An unclear deliverable review and approval cycle can lead to project delays.	Finalize the deliverable review and acceptance process that clarifies to whom the deliverables are to be submitted, how the deliverables are to be provided, how the recipients are to be notified (e.g., SharePoint alert or email notification), and when review comments are due in order to finalize the deliverables on a timely basis. Include this process in the PMP.	December 2018	3	3	Med	Retired	3/29/2019	3/29/2019 - IV&V is retiring this risk as the deliverable review process has fully adopted and implemented by the project team. 2/28/2019 - The project made progress in mitigating this risk in February. DHS developed, and the project team adopted, a deliverable review and approval process. The project team is adjusting to the process along with revisions to the tracking/reporting methodology for deliverables. With consideration to the deliverables expected to be received in March, IVV will observe the deliverable review process and potential retirement of this risk. 1/31/2019 - Both the ASI and DHS proposed deliverable review and approval processes in January. The DHS PMO and BES Project Manager drafted a deliverable review/approval process that includes the PMO preferred Deliverable Comment Form (DCF) to aggregate reviewer comments. The ASI included a deliverable review/approval process along with an alternate comment form within the draft PMP. The DHS PMO is working with the ASI to determine the process to be implemented and, when agreed upon, roll-out to the Project Team. 12/31/2018 - IVV provided a sample of a deliverable management process on 12/20/18 to the DHS Project Manager that could be modified for the BES Project. The DHS PM and the PMO are developing a review and approval process and are in discussions with the ASI to mitigate the risk. Until a process is developed, finalized, and executed, DHS, the ASI and IV&V will use email notifications to ensure new and/or updated deliverables will be reviewed timely. Additionally, the ASI and IV&V developed MS-Excel spreadsheets to track status.		
3	Project Status Reporting does not meet with expectations or Best Practices for presenting status updates of schedule, cost, scope, risks, issues, and change management, which may inhibit effective project management and limit project transparency.	Although the Project Status Report follows the RFP requirements, IV&V has observed that the Status Report does not list/track all of the current project tasks and activities, and appears to primarily reflect tasks and activities requiring DHS participation. Additionally, the content of the Project Status Report in some areas (e.g., risks and issues) is redundant to BES SharePoint Log. Examples include: 1. The Project Status Report does not include tracking of ALL current tasks and activities. It appears to largely be limited to only tasks and activities requiring DHS participation. 2. The Project Status Report includes multiple sections for Risks and Issues, which are redundant to a corollary SharePoint Risk and Issue Log. 3. All current 'Issues' cited in the Status Report are incorrectly listed as 'Risks' in the Risk and Issues Log on SharePoint.	Reporting Project Status on some, but not all, areas of the project provides an incomplete understanding of the status of the entire project. A complete understanding is necessary to ensure that scope, cost, and schedule parameters are all being met across the project.	IVV recommends that DHS, the ASI, and IVV jointly determine revisions to the Project Status Report that would meet the needs of reporting on all active tasks and activities, and that redundancy between the data contained in the Project Status Reports and the SharePoint logs is removed.	February 2019	5	3	Med	Retired	6/24/2019	06/24/2019 - Since the format and level of detail of content of the Project Status Report has been static for several weeks with DHS Project Management in agreement on content, IVV is closing this finding. 05/31/2019 - Project Status Reporting continues to show improvement. The schedule was conditionally approved in late May and IVV anticipates seeing more schedule information reported on in status reports going forward. IVV will continue to monitor this risk to verify that observed improvements are sustained. IVV maintains this is a medium risk the project as of the May 2019 reporting period. 04/30/2019 - Over the last two weeks in April, the ASI has incorporated several improvements to project status reporting, in terms of both structure and more detailed content. As a result, IVV has noted significantly increased participation from DHS based on the improved status details provided by the ASI. IVV is encouraged by the progress seen in the April 2019 reporting period, however, given that the schedule still lack sufficient detail, DHS has little information to track project status towards or to gain insights into whether project activities will meet established project milestone. Hence, IVV maintains that this remains a Medium risk to the project and will continue to monitor this finding to verify that the changes made thus far continue, and that the status reports and meetings continue to improve. 3/29/2019 - IV&V acknowledges that the ASI has made multiple changes to the weekly status report. Nevertheless, the changes have not satisfactorily improved the State's understanding of project progress nor provided sufficient transparency into ASI activities. The ASI weekly status report must present sufficient project information for the report to independently stand on its own; providing enough content and detail that any project stakeholder reading the report would have a clear understanding of project accomplishments, in-progress work, planned work, changes, and potential challenges. IV&V recommends that the ASI provide additional information that will enable greater insight into project activities, which may include the following: - An aggregate of hours spent on in-progress tasks, activities, and deliverables - In-progress task, activity, deliverable, and work product percent complete, and the delta in progress from week to week - Expected completion dates of all in-progress tasks, activities, deliverables, and work products, updated weekly, directly from the updated schedule - Detailed	06/11/19 5 Brown: The format of the current weekly status report is based on a template provided by the client. The format and level of detail of content has been static for many weeks with client PM agreement after each meeting that the content is as expected. We request IV and V provide a specific timeline that this item is successfully delivered and able to be closed. 2/6/19, Bill Thornton, Unisys: Findings and Recommendations (#3) – Project Management Status reporting – The original status report adhered to the DED – it has been adjusted multiple times based on feedback. 12/6/18, Keith Stock, Unisys: 3) Status report structure is dictated by the RFP. There is an ongoing action item to modify structure and content by mutual agreement	

Finding Number	Title	Observation	Significance	Recommendation	Event Horizon	Impact	Probability	Analyst Priority	Finding Status	Date Retired	Status Update	Client Comments	Vendor Comments
2	Late delivery of project deliverables may result in schedule delays.	<p>Based upon the project schedule dated 11/26/18 (refer to schedule for specifics), several due dates for project deliverables have been missed. As of the date of this report, these deliverables include the Project Management Plan (PMP), which is the formal document that is used to manage the execution of the project. In some instances, this risk may be compounded by a backlog of Deliverable Expectation Documents (DED) requiring approval and acceptance from the State.</p>	<p>Without a PMP that depicts all Project Management processes, the Project can suffer unplanned consequences in scope, schedule, cost, and quality parameters. Without a schedule that provides the required level of detail to manage the work, the project is at risk to be successful.</p>	<p>IVV recommends that the ASI complete the Project Management Plan deliverable, work with DHS and IVV for review and edit as needed, and attain approval of the PMP. This will help ensure that all processes within the project management entity are thoughtfully and collaboratively developed and implemented to meet the needs of the project. Review and update the project schedule to capture and discuss the late deliverables and tasks and delivery thereof; needed mitigation actions along with identification and agreement with DHS on DDI to resolve the late activities and tasks.</p> <p>Updated recommendation 10/10/2019:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue to manage and track the schedule to ensure deliverables are provided as planned. - Review the schedule critical path in the weekly schedule review meeting. - Continue to meet weekly with DHS to convey new schedule changes, obstacles, and document the corrective actions that will be taken to address schedule delays and obstacle resolution. - Determine if the stopped work on TDDs will impact the schedule, and update accordingly - Determine if rework to FDDs will impact the schedule, and update accordingly - Analyze the project schedule activities to identify any opportunities to make up time resulting from the current delayed activities - Develop a process for determining what functionality will be delivered as part of an iteration, determine how many iterations there will be, and update the schedule accordingly 	TBD	4	5	High	Open		<p>9/30/2019 - As of the September reporting period, IVV has escalated this risk to an issue, with a high criticality rating. The ASI reported two significant project delays this month. The KOLEA MDM implementation planned for October 2019 is now delayed to November/December 2019. The delays on some of the JAD / Workgroup sessions, coupled with the ASI reporting that they have stopped work on most of the TDDs, has delayed the UAT start date for the BES implementation by three weeks. The total impact is still being analyzed by the ASI. The ASI also reported the format of the Functional and Technical Design Document Deliverables have been modified to align to the approved DEDs, of which some have already been submitted to DHS in the prior format and will cause rework for previously submitted FDDs and TDDs. Additionally, the Bi-12 Architecture document is on-hold pending DHS/ASI project decisions. Further, the schedule is not updated with the detail to plan when the approximate 1,000 functional and technical design components will be submitted to DHS for review. The ASI also reported the Functional and Technical Design documents will be packaged for DHS review based on those that are ready to review vs. by functional area. It is unclear to IVV if these deliverables will be organized or in a format that provides a cohesive review of the end-to-end solution. IVV will continue to monitor this issue. 8/31/2019 - IVV continues to monitor schedule progress. The conversion activities and tasks were added to the master schedule, and task status was updated on August 28, 2019. The 90/10 functionality schedule is complete and is being managed separate from the Master Schedule. Additionally, changes may be necessary to the schedule once the FDD/TDD process to include integration points is finalized. Although the ASI reported that some tasks are late in the August 27, 2019 project schedule review meeting, they are not on the critical path. IVV will continue to monitor this finding. 07/31/2019 - The number of late tasks in the schedule version (July 26, 2019) has been reduced to four tasks as reported by MS-Project Late Task Report. IVV acknowledges the ASI reviewed the critical path schedule with DHS and IVV this month and the ASI's positive changes to the schedule to include establishing the July 26, 2019 schedule as the baseline. In the schedule review meeting on 7/30/19 the ASI indicated the Conversion and KOLEA 90/10 Functionality schedules will be sub-plans to the Master Schedule.</p>	<p>12/16/18, Keith Stock, Unisys: We don't disagree with the statements but assigning this high which states "a major disruption is likely and the consequences would be unacceptable" seems inappropriate.</p> <p>2/6/19, Bill Thornton, Unisys: Executive Summary Risks Feedback The project schedule has been baselined but it needs to be re-baselined based on the approval dates of the DED's. Deliverable delays – as deliverables are not supposed to be started until the DED is approved, the deliverables are not delayed, they need to be re-baselined based on the DED approval. Findings and Recommendations (#2) – Project Management ASI submitted 19 deliverables and DEDs – Clarification – there were 2 deliverables submitted (8i-8 Technical specs for the non-prod environments and Bi-4 the PMP) – the rest were DEDs. Deliverable Review process has not been finalized – this is part of the PMP document Late deliverables – as deliverables are not supposed to be started until the DED is approved, the deliverables are not delayed, they need to be re-baselined based on the DED approval 3/13/19 Bill Thornton, Unisys: Specific to the PMP, the DED was approved by DHS on 1/15/2019 and the deliverable submitted on 1/21/2019. Specific to the project schedule, the DED was approved by DHS on 1/23/2019 and the deliverable is planned for submission the week of 3/18/2019.</p> <p>6/11/19: The ASI and client are holding daily stand up meetings to review progress made that day, any issues identified and the plan for the following day. These meetings specifically review the schedule and review opportunities for pull in. The ASI and client are also holding weekly standup meetings with the entire team to review progress, issues, and activities coming up the following week with the objective of collaboration and joint ownership of the projects progress and schedule</p> <p>09/12/19 SB: The ASI meets weekly with DHS to review the schedule in detail and will continue to do so. As noted earlier, the ASI and DHS are assessing options to simplify the schedule and work item tracking process.</p> <p>10/10/19 SB: The ASI is working in close collaboration with DHS on the schedule and are assessing options to the project schedule and content and would ask the IV and V to reflect DHS's current assessment of this issue.</p>	
1	Current project management techniques in the JAR and JAD sessions may negatively impact system design	<p>Finding: IV&V has observed weak meeting facilitation skills and noted that meeting minutes or notes from all of the Joint Application Review (JAR) and Joint Application Design (JAD) sessions are not posted on the BES SharePoint site.</p> <p>General Observation from October reporting period: During requirements validation, all Policy requirements were 'docked', or tabled, for further research and discussion. It is unclear whether Policy requirements should be met within the BES solution, or outside of the BES solution. How the requirements and processes for Preliminary Eligibility requirements can or should be satisfied within BES is a large process change for DHS. It was clear during requirements validation that there was not agreement on how this should work within BES and DHS, so all Preliminary Eligibility requirements were docked for further research.</p>	<p>If JAR and JAD notes are not consistently posted, session participants are unable to validate if input has been accurately recorded, potentially affecting BES system functionality.</p>	<p>Implement project management best practices and identify opportunities to improve meeting management techniques. Publish/post missing JAR/JAD session notes on SharePoint, and moving forward, publish notes within a reasonable period of time (e.g., 24 hrs) after completion of any given session.</p>	Q3 2019	4	3	Med	Retired	6/28/2019	<p>06/28/2019 - IVV has observed that Project Management effectiveness for the JADs and Workgroups has improved over recent weeks. - JAD packets have been provided and approved in advance of each meeting series. - Meeting Minutes are generally provided within a couple days after the meeting. Based on these improvements, IVV is closing this risk as it relates to the JADs project management techniques. However, IVV remains concerned about, and will continue to monitor, the consistency of the effectiveness of JAD facilitation, which may impact the elicitation of information from DHS SMEs. 05/31/2019 - DHS approved some of the JAD/Workgroup templates provided by the ASI in May (Appeals and Common Functions), and provided feedback to the ASI for correction on others (Random Moment Time Study). IVV continues to observe some PM meeting practices that, while progress in May was observed, are still in need of improvement, as the following occurred multiple times during the month: - unclear meeting logistics and information provided to meeting attendees, including providing clarity on meeting invites as to whether in-person attendance is required or not, and providing multiple call-in phone numbers on meeting invites when only one is used; - not setting up for meetings prior to their scheduled start times, resulting in meetings starting late and not covering all planned agenda items. IVV will continue to monitor project and meeting management techniques for effectiveness in JADs and Workgroups as this activity is re-initiated. The risk remains a Medium priority for the May 2019 reporting period. 04/30/2019 - Unisys and DHS continue to meet to discuss the JAD templates, and progress has been made. DHS plans to review the latest version of the templates the week of April 29, 2019. Until these templates are approved, JADs will remain on hold, while the MDM and Technical Workgroups continue to meet weekly. IVV will continue to monitor this risk in May, and will review the updated JAD templates as they are made available. The risk remains a Medium priority for the April 2019 reporting period, and IVV will continue to monitor progress made by the ASI. 03/26/2019 - IV&V notes that the third round of PMP comments by IV&V and DHS has been submitted to the ASI, but the deliverable has not yet been accepted. DHS deemed the PMP as sufficient enough to allow ASI-led Workgroup Meetings to commence in March 2019. IV&V will continue to monitor this risk through acceptance of the</p>	<p>06/11/19 S Brown: The ASI provided facilitation training to the BA team to ensure standardized facilitation in client meetings. The ASI has also paired senior BA's with less experienced team members to ensure quality facilitation. The IV and V has selectively noted occurrences of issues in setting up meetings. It would be helpful if the IV and V would quantify the percent of meetings were these issues have occurred. As measured by the Client PM's feedback, we suggest that these occurrences are infrequent and are becoming even less frequent as the process matures. Meeting minutes are now done by dedicated scribes for key meetings, minutes are QA'd, and posted in a timely manner to SharePoint. All recently submitted packets (5) have been approved by DHS as submitted.</p> <p>2019/03/13 Bill Thornton, Unisys: Data collected in the initial JADs is useful and will be documented in the use cases and FDDs for those subject areas.</p> <p>2019/03/13 Bill Thornton, Unisys: Data collected in the initial JADs is useful and will be documented in the use cases and FDDs for those subject areas.</p>	