

# Project Portfolio Executive Summary for May 2015

## UW Enterprise Projects

Projects - Yellow	Sponsor	Oversight Level *	Project Health **	Overall Risk Rating ***	Budget Rating	Schedule Rating	Scope Rating	Issues Rating	Actual Cost (Project Life)	Budget (Project Life)
<b>Enterprise Document Management System Implementation</b>	Gary Quarfoth Ann Anderson	2 - OCIO	<b>Yellow</b>	11	4	4	2	5	\$4,642,752	\$5,361,192
<p><b>Project Status:</b></p> <p>RISK 1: CONCERT is missing critical skill sets and is over capacity. This is impacting our scope and schedule, and threatening our budget.</p> <p>RISK 1 Action Plan: Currently onboarding a new release manager, representing one of the 4 key roles we are missing. Seeking approval to move forward with recruiting a new BA, PM, QA/SDET.</p> <p>RISK 2: Difficulty of managing modernization initiatives, given CONCERT and customer staffing and general maturity. For both CONCERT and customers to be successful, we need to frame modernization initiatives as multi-phased efforts up front, and set better expectations about the skill sets customers need to acquire as they move to modern processes and technologies.</p> <p>RISK 2 Action Plan: Working with Sponsors on refining our engagement methodology, and also on framing our funding and cost recovery discussions in a way that incents our customers to be successful.</p> <p>Updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruited and hired UW-IT's first Release manager! HeaKyung Park starts on 4/8. She will be reporting to me but matrixed into CI.</li> <li>• We are nearing completion of a infrastructure refresh that has greatly streamlined our architecture and helped us cross train the development team. Benefits include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ About \$100k of savings on the cost of our infrastructure in FY16.</li> <li>○ More flexibility in our internal capacity management due to the cross training and the move to a Linux platform.</li> <li>○ Less reliance on both internal and external partners to get day to day work done.</li> </ul>                     We have onboarded our new contractor (Bezzotech) and integrated them into the team for the customer migration projects. Based on our experience with them and the knowledge transfer we are doing, we expect to spend about \$250 - \$300k less in consulting dollars for operational support in FY16, and save our customers hundreds of thousands of dollars as well.                 </li> <li>• Our SFS and Procurement projects are 2-3 weeks behind schedule, due to the realization of the risks above. New target go-live is May 18th. We are within budget.</li> <li>• We are wrapping up analysis and design efforts with Facilities and are planning for a July go-live for phase 1 of that project.</li> <li>• We have started supporting the OSFA Scoping work with the Student team.</li> </ul>										

## Project Portfolio Executive Summary for May 2015

Projects - Red	Sponsor	Oversight Level *	Project Health **	Overall Risk Rating ***	Budget Rating	Schedule Rating	Scope Rating	Issues Rating	Actual Cost (Project Life)	Budget (Project Life)
<b>HR/Payroll Modernization</b>	V'ella Warren Mindy Kornberg Cheryl Cameron Lori Mitchell	3 - OCIO	<b>Red</b>	15	4	4	2	5	\$21,009,157	\$67,464,473

**Project Status:** In February 2015, the HR/P Executive Sponsors made the decision to maintain a semi-monthly pay frequency with Workday instead of moving to a biweekly cycle.

The initial decision to move to biweekly payroll was made for two reasons: 1) At the time Workday was selected, the semi-monthly configuration did not meet our compliance needs; 2) It provided efficiencies and reporting of benefit to UWMC and HMC. We made this decision with the assumption that there would not be a negative impact on academic pay.

However, as configuration of Workday commenced, we learned that Workday's biweekly configuration would not allow us to pay many of our faculty, extension lecturers and academic student employees without substantial changes to the structure of their pay or our academic schedule. Due to many consideration including union contracts, it was decided that making changes to that structure was not feasible.

Fortunately Workday continually releases updates and enhancements. By late summer 2015, Workday expects to have a compliant semi-monthly version. With regard to UWMC/HMC's concerns, actions are underway to identify reporting and data warehousing solutions to partially address concerns.

On the positive side, this decision substantially reduces some of our highest project risks, including: integrations of the Workday system with mainframe, data warehouses and downstream systems; and monthly reporting to the Department of Retirement Systems. It also helps to mitigate the risk of user acceptance by reducing the change impacts.

Following the decision to remain on a semi-monthly pay frequency, the HR/P project team analyzed the impacts on business processes, design, configuration and integrations, training and change management, and other University and unit systems. In early April 2015, the project's Executive Sponsors decided that the initial December 2015 go-live date was not feasible. Staying the course for a December 2015 launch date would not allow for any schedule flexibility, which would be challenging due to numerous overlapping activities. In addition, a December go-live date would compress the time needed for change management and user engagement, as well as the work of partner projects (e.g., UW-IT, the Medical Centers, HR Information Systems, and the School of Medicine), all of which is critical to the success of the HR/P project.

Pushing out the timeline ensures the schedule is less compressed, and provides additional time for testing and issue resolution. It also reduces the risk of finding errors and workarounds needed after go-live, and provides additional time for change management, user engagement, and readiness activities. In addition, shifting the timeline provides an increased likelihood of success with changes to all impacted systems by HR/P partners. The project team, along with related partner projects (Medical Centers, UW-IT, HR Information Systems, and the School of Medicine), are working to determine a new go-live date. The new date should be finalized in May 2015.

While there are increased project costs, the timeline extension does not impact the overall project budget. The HR/Payroll Modernization project costs to date are under budget by \$4.8 million. In addition, a \$10 million contingency was built into the project budget that will cover any project delays for three to six months beyond the initial go-live date.

## Project Portfolio Executive Summary for May 2015

### UW Medicine Projects

Projects - Yellow	Sponsor	Oversight Level *	Project Health **	Overall Risk Rating ***	Budget Rating	Schedule Rating	Scope Rating	Issues Rating	Actual Cost (Project Life)	Budget (Project Life)
<b>Pharmacy Inventory Management System</b>	Shabir Somani	2 - UW	Yellow	12	3	4	2	3	\$841,937	\$6,941,089

**Project Status:** The Pharmacy Inventory Management System (PIMS) project continues to be in the Planning and Analysis phase. UW Medicine and TECSYS (system vendor) are working towards confirming and finalizing project scope, timeline, and resources.

Current major activities include:

- Facilitation and participation in project planning on-site sessions with vendor (TECSYS) 4/27 – 4/30/2015
- Continued assessment of vendor software functionality
- Confirmation of project scope and schedule based on software functionality delivery schedule
- Determination of carousel ordering and installation schedule
- Finalization of project plan and charter
- Completion of work on technical infrastructure
- Steering Committee meeting in early May with planned discussion on engagement of external QA assessment and next steps

Upcoming major milestones include:

- Vendor delivery of revised project plan.

Major Risks/Issues:

- Issue - Vendor Functionality into Project Plan: Vendor continues to work on software functionality. This continues to directly impact project scoping and scheduling.
- Risk - Central user authentication preferred across the UW Medicine entities: Lack of enterprise authentication may have schedule impacts.
- Risk - Accounting Resource Conflicts: Potential Accounting resource conflicts with other projects that have independent timelines (SCCA PeopleSoft, UW's HR/P Modernization). May impact PIMS implementation.

Note: The percent complete appears as 0% because the project is still in the planning and analysis phase, and has not yet conducted project kick-off.

## Project Portfolio Executive Summary for May 2015

Projects – Complete	Sponsor	Oversight Level *	Monitor of Benefits/Value Realized
<b>Epic Enterprise Specialty Implementation:</b> Project went live 5/20/14	Johnese Spisso James Fine	1 - UW	

* Oversight Level Key	
1	Overseen by UW management and staff. Requires OCIO approval and reporting if over delegated authority.
2	OCIO approval required and regular project reporting. Quality Assurance (QA) reporting required, maybe internal or external. OCIO may recommend project to be full Technology Services Board (TSB) oversight.
3	High severity and/or high risk, subject to full TSB oversight, which includes TSB approval, written reports to the TSB, periodic status reports to the TSB by the agency director and staff, and submission of other reports as directed by the TSB. External QA reporting required.

** Project Health Key	
<b>Green</b>	Project is on time, on budget, and within defined scope. <b>Overall Risk Rating where 4-9 is Green.</b>
<b>Yellow</b>	Changes to scope, budget, or resources have placed project at some risk. Project has the potential for delays or scope changes. <b>Overall Risk Rating where 10-14 is Yellow.</b>
<b>Red</b>	Major changes to scope, budget or resources have placed project at critical risk. One or more of the following must change in order to proceed: project schedule, resources, budget, scope. <b>Overall Risk Rating where 15-20 is Red.</b>

**Note for UW Medicine:** project oversight levels 2 & 3 report to UW management

*** IT Project Risk Ratings	
Current Risk Rating	Use the scale below to rate current performance on <b>Budget, Schedule</b> and <b>Scope</b> (select appropriate number for each)
Budget =	1 = Performing better than project plan; ahead by 5% or more 2 = Performance is on plan
Schedule =	3 = Behind plan, but within 5% of original targets 4 = Behind plan between 6% to 10% and likely to use/using contingency
Scope =	5 = Greater than 10% behind plan and more than half of contingency used
Current Risk Rating	Use the scale below to rate current impact of <b>Issues</b> and other factors relevant to the project (select one number for this measure)
Issues =	1 = No risks or issues identified at this time 2 = Some identified but minor, no impacts anticipated 3 = Some that could impact the project are being managed, with minimal impact anticipated 4 = Significant risks/issues/other factors identified but not yet managed 5 = Risks/issues being managed but will have significant impact (greater than 10%) on project budget, schedule and/or scope