PRSM

Project Resourcing & Schedule

Management System

Quarterly PRSM Status Report to the Legislature

December 1, 2009 – February 28, 2010

Caltrans THE LEADERS IN QUALITY TRANSPORTATION

California Department of Transportation

Division of Project Management

Office of Statewide Project Management Improvement

Table of Contents

Independent Projects Oversight Report

IPO Report for February 2010

Project Name:	Caltrans PRSM	**Assessment Date:**	Feb 26, 2010
		Frequency:	Monthly

Oversight Provider Information

Oversight Leader:	Greg Thomas	Organization:	Deloitte & Touche LLP
Phone Number:	916 288 3232	Email:	gregthomas@deloitte.com

Project Information

Project Number:	2660-160	Department:	Transportation (Caltrans)
Criticality:	High	Agency:	Business, Transportation & Housing
Last Approved Document/Date:	SPR (12/08/09)	Total One-time Cost:	$26,078,375
Start Date:	June 7, 2000	End Date:	June 13, 2011
Project Manager:	David Youmans	Organization:	Caltrans
Phone Number:	916.826.4425	Email:	david_youmans@dot.ca.gov

Summary: Current Status

Project Phase:	Adaptation		
Planned Start Date:	May 20,, 2009	Planned End Date:	February 2, 2010
Actual Start Date:	July 1, 2009	Forecasted End Date:	June 29, 2010

Schedule

Select the statement that most closely applies, measured against the last Finance approved document.

Ahead-of-schedule:
One or more major tasks or milestones have been completed and approved early (> 5%)
All other major tasks and milestones completed and approved according to plan

> **Behind Schedule**

On-schedule:
All major tasks and milestones have been completed and approved according to plan.
(Within 5%)

Behind Schedule:
One or more major tasks or milestones are expected to be delayed. (> 5%)

Comments: A new baseline schedule was set with the approved SPR dated December 8, 2009. The SPR states the end date of the Adaptation Phase as February 2010. In the January 26, 2010 PRSM Project status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Adaptation Phase completion date as June 29, 2010. For the Adaptation Phase, this represents a difference of four (4) months or approximately a 57% delay.

Additionally, the SPR states the end date of the entire PRSM project as June 13, 2011. In the January 26, 2010 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the PRSM Project completion date as October 13, 2011. This represents an extension of the project by four (4) months or approximately a 15% delay.

Given this change, IPOC has reported the project as "Behind Schedule". Please note that the PRSM Project Team is still in the process of determining the overall timeline for the project. While the end of the Adaptation Phase milestone is behind schedule by 4 months it is possible that the project will complete on time (by June 13, 2011). Efforts by the PRSM Project Team, such as concurrent configuration of agreed upon requirements, are currently underway to offset some of the delay in Adaptation. We will continue to closely monitor the schedule status during the Adaptation Phase and report any updates as they occur. Please see the risks section below for information regarding further potential impact to the schedule.

Resources (Level of Effort) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Fewer Resources
Completion of one or more major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) fewer hours/staff than planned.

Within Resources
All major tasks have been completed and acceptable products created using the planned number of hours/staff (within 5%).

Within Resources

More Resources
Completion of major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) more hours/staff than planned.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR dated 12/08/2009.

Resources (Budget/Cost) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Less cost
The project is (>5%) under budget.

Within cost
The project is operating within budget.

Within Cost

Higher cost
Material budget increases (>5%) are likely.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR dated 12/08/2009.

Quality (Client Functionality) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined
Required client functionality is adequately defined, and is being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Adequately Defined

Inadequately Defined
One or more significant components of required client functionality are inadequately defined, or are not being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Comments: Functionality is adequately defined for the Adaptation Phase which began on July 1, 2009. In February 2010, the Implementation Vendor delivered the third checkpoint review, which included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in previous checkpoints. Configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor. The PRSM Project Team has been made aware that Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system and Earned Value Reporting System (EVRS) are going to be phased out once the ERP Financial Infrastructure (EFIS) has been implemented. Based on this information, the PRSM Project Team has created PCR 13, which involves building an interface to EFIS. PCR 13 is currently under analysis (analysis activities include requirements identification). In addition, there are currently 3 open Project Change Requests (PCR's) that include changes and/or deletions to existing requirements / functionality (PCR 8, 9, and 12). The majority of these changes involve interface

requirements. The PRSM Change Management Team has placed these PCR's on hold until PCR 13 has been approved.

Quality (Architecture/System Performance) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined
The system technical architecture is adequately defined, and modeling, benchmarking and testing are being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

| Adequately Defined |

Inadequately Defined
The system technical architecture is not adequately defined, or modeling, benchmarking and testing are not being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Comments: System technical architecture and performance are adequately defined for the Adaptation Phase. The Implementation Vendor has submitted a Configuration Management Plan, High Level Design, and updated Architecture Diagram. Production equipment has been procured and is on-site. Application installation of the production environment is scheduled to begin in March 2010. The previous issue with the development environment has been resolved. Currently research is being performed to determine the cause of the issue.

Issues

Issue Title: EFIS Interface

Issue Statement: The PRSM Project Team has been made aware that Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system and Earned Value Reporting System (EVRS) are going to be phased out once the ERP Financial Infrastructure (EFIS) has been implemented. While developing to one standard interface presents a business opportunity, specifications and data requirements will need to be analyzed and documented. The development of the EFIS interface is a critical step for the PRSM project to proceed to the Pilot phase. Currently EFIS is scheduled to go-live in July 2010 and PRSM is scheduled to begin Pilot on 6/28/2010. A delay in the EFIS schedule could significantly delay the PRSM pilot and roll out to the Districts. In addition, the development of the EFIS interface could impact the cost of PRSM. There are three (3) potential scenarios related to this issue that could impact the schedule and/or cost: 1) a delay in the EFIS project could result in a delay to PRSM; 2) the complexity of the interface to EFIS and the activities/tasks involved could result in a delay to PRSM and/or impact cost; and 3) a delay in the EFIS training schedule could conflict with the PRSM training schedule, which could result in a delay to PRSM.

Impact: High   Time Frame: Short Term   Severity: High   Assigned to: Jacqueline Moore

Recommendations:

- Develop a detailed action plan for the EFIS interface that addresses the following: impact to the data conversion effort, impact to districts and end users, impact to project resources, impact to schedule, and impact to costs.

- Update the PRSM project schedule with the activities associated with the EFIS interface, including analysis activities.

- Continue to work closely with the EFIS project by attending the bi-weekly interface planning meetings. Escalate issues related to EFIS timing and resource needs to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution as soon as the interface requirements are finalized.

Status Update:

Feb 10 Status: The PRSM Project Team has been performing analysis activities for the EFIS interface during the month of February. The EFIS and PRSM Project Teams have been meeting on a weekly basis to discuss the EFIS project and its interface to PRSM. In addition three (3) EFIS risks have been added to the PRSM Risk Log, risks 76A, 76B, and 77. These risks are discussed during the monthly PRSM Risk Management meeting. The next PRSM Risk Management meeting is scheduled for March 3rd.

Jan 10 Status: The PRSM Project Team has created Project Change Request (PCR) 13 for the EFIS interface effort. PCR 13 is currently under analysis.

New Risks

No new risks

Progress Toward Addressing Prior Risks

Risk Title: PRSM Task Dependency Identification

Risk Statement: Recent activities to refresh/reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. The identification of these could result in further delay to the overall project schedule.

Probability: High   Impact: High   Time Frame: Long Term   Severity: High   Assigned to: David Youmans

Recommendation:

- During the weekly PRSM Project Status meetings, IPOC recommends that each of the Caltrans PRSM Project Team Workgroups conduct brief and more frequent status meetings regarding status of tasks, dependencies, risks and issues associated with those tasks. In addition, IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team continues to refine the schedule for project phases after Adaptation to ensure that any risk of further schedule slippage is mitigated and so that the total impact of known dependencies on the schedule can be understood and communicated to stakeholders.

Status Update:

Feb 10 Status: No new status

Jan 10 Status: The PRSM Project Team has continued to reevaluate the PRSM Project Schedule during the month of December. During the weekly PRSM Project Status meetings, current and up-coming tasks are discussed and risks and dependencies associated with those tasks are identified. For a status update on the requirements baselining process, please refer to Risk **Business Rules and Business Process Changes** below.

Risk Title: PRSM Project Team Communications

Risk Statement: Effective, clear and frequent communications between the Caltrans PRSM team, the Implementation Vendor, other vendors (e.g., testing and data conversion), and District stakeholder is critical given the size and complexity of PRSM during the Adaptation Phase. The new Communications Plan, while documented, needs to be fully implemented early in the Adaptation Phase. Without effective communications, the PRSM project schedule, scope and quality could be difficult to manage and control.

Probability: Medium   Impact: High   Time Frame: Long Term   Severity: High   Assigned to: David Youmans

Recommendation:

- In addition to the weekly PRSM Project Status meetings, IPOC recommends that Caltrans PRSM Project Management and Implementation Vendor Project Management conduct frequent status meetings in order to discuss the status of high priority issues and action items. These checkpoint meetings should be no longer than ½ hour in duration and conducted twice per week (i.e., Monday AM and Thursday PM).

- Expedite the communication of the detailed To-Be Business Process changes to the Districts so that they can gain a better understanding of the impacts and benefits of PRSM.

Status Update:

Feb 10 Status: The PRSM Project Team has identified the need to establish and document Marketing activities in order to provide Districts will more detailed information regarding PRSM features. Currently this task has been assigned to an owner, who is in the process of identifying the detailed tasks associated with this effort and incorporating them into the PRSM schedule.

Jan 10 Status: Beginning in January 2010, project risks have been added as a discussion point during the weekly PRSM project status meetings. During this discussion, a select number of risks are discussed, including their current status, impact, and remediation steps. The Communications Plan was formally approved in the month of August and provides details surrounding the methods of communication for the PRSM project. PRSM Project Status meetings continue to occur on a weekly basis. PRSM sub-teams meet at a minimum of once a week to discuss current and upcoming tasks. In addition to the PRSM Project Team meetings, Caltrans prepares and distributes a monthly newsletter and "Nuggets of Knowledge" memo to the districts. Implementation Team training sessions have been scheduled during the month of September that will provide the PRSM Implementation Team with an overview of PRSM Methodology and Functionality.

Risk Title: Resource Availability

Risk Statement: Without adequate Caltrans resources working on PRSM, the project implementation schedule could be delayed. While in the Adaptation Phase, PRSM Project Team members should be allocated full time. Individual Resources may need to be identified at the task level in the Project Plan in order to estimate resource requirements and availability.

Probability: Medium   Impact: High   Time Frame: Short   Severity: High   Assigned to: TBD

Recommendations:

- After the PRSM work plan is complete, determine the resource gaps and reallocate effort as appropriate.

- Assign individual resources at the task level in the project schedule to assist in estimating resource requirements. All PRSM project resources, including vendor resources, should be included.

Status Update:

Feb 10 Status: No new status

Jan 10 Status: During the September 09 reporting period, a CA Clarity technical resource was unavailable during the business objects migration to virtual environments. This resulted in a delay of the business object migration task.

Risk Title: Business Rules and Business Process Changes

Risk Statement: The impact of business changes resulting from the PRSM implementation needs to be sufficiently understood, planned for, and communicated to Caltrans staff. If District field staff are not in agreement with the decisions and consequences of changing/standardizing business rules and business processes, it may have an adverse effect on system acceptance and may disrupt work in progress. This could result in increased resistance to acceptance and usage of the system.

Probability: High   Impact: High   Time Frame: Med   Severity: High   Assigned to: David Cordone

Recommendations:

- Implement a formal change management process which will be used for PRSM project related changes. Change management tasks associated with these changes should be incorporated into the project schedule and budget. Changes should be communicated to the key stakeholders.

- Define the process for gaining field consensus on the new business rules and business processes.

- Develop a plan that describes how information on new business rules and business processes will be communicated to the field with sufficient time to get feedback and buy-in.

- Expedite the communication of the detailed To-Be Business Process changes to the Districts so that they can gain a better understanding of the impacts and benefits of PRSM.

Status Update:

Feb 10 Status: No new status

Jan 10 Status: There are currently 3 open Project Change Requests (PCR's) that include changes and/or deletions to existing requirements / functionality (PCR 8, 9, and 12). The majority of these changes involve interface requirements. The PRSM Change Management Team has placed these PCR's on hold until PCR 13 (Developing an Interface to EFIS) has been approved.

General Comments

Deloitte & Touche LLP's IPOC contract with the Caltrans PRSM project started in December 2008. This Independent Project Oversight Report (IPOR) provided by Deloitte & Touche LLP has been developed in accordance with the applicable standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) as per Deloitte & Touche LLP policy. IPOC has attended various PRSM project meetings throughout the month of February, including PRSM Status meetings, PRSM Change Management meetings, the PRSM Implementation Managers meeting, PRSM Risk Management meeting, and the PRSM Advisory Committee meeting.

The PRSM project is in the Adaptation Part B Phase of the project. Five deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Adaptation Phase: Application Installation Report, Data Initialization Plan, Training Role Descriptions and Course List, Training and Documentation Plan and Pilot Plan. IPOC is planning to review each of these deliverables as they are submitted and will provide comments and feedback.

PRSM project status meetings occur on a weekly basis. During the status meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in Microsoft Project for the current phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones. The status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register. In addition, PRSM Change Management meetings occur on a weekly basis following the PRSM status meeting. During these meetings new and open project change requests (PCR's) are discussed by PRSM Project Management and the Implementation Vendor Project Manager.

The Implementation Vendor has submitted an Adaptation Phase schedule to Caltrans, which separates the Adaptation Phase into two parts (A and B). In addition, the Implementation Plan was submitted, which was reviewed by Caltrans, and includes a schedule for the entire project. The Implementation Vendor is using a Rolling Wave scheduling process for the PRSM project where a more detailed schedule is prepared before the start of each project phase. Prior to the end of each phase or PRSM Payment Point, the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans will work together to develop the specific activities for the tasks in the next Rolling Wave. In October 2009, the Implementation Vendor proposed a new implementation approach to replace the iterative work package approach. This new approach involves establishing a series of checkpoints throughout the remainder of the Adaptation Phase. During each checkpoint, configured or customized functionality is reviewed by the PRSM Project Team through meetings facilitated by the Implementation Vendor. In December 2009, the Implementation Vendor delivered the second Checkpoint review, which included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in both checkpoints one and two.

In addition to the new implementation approach, recent activities to refresh/reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. As a result of this, the PRSM Project Team tasked the individual PRSM workgroups (i.e. Training Team, Configuration Team, etc...) with break down the tasks for their group and identifying tasks and dependencies. On October 20, 2009 the PRSM Project Team held a PRSM Schedule Review Meeting with all of the workgroups, where the updated tasks and dependencies for each workgroup where presented to the entire PRSM Project Team. Based on the output of this session, an updated schedule was produced which includes the updated tasks, dependencies, and resources. This updated schedule is scheduled to be finalized in January and will include resource loading. Project Change Requests (PCR's) have been created for changes to and/or deletions of PRSM requirements. There are currently 3 open Project Change Requests (PCR's) that include changes and/or deletions to existing requirements / functionality (PCR 8, 9, and 12). The majority of these changes involve interface requirements. The PRSM Change Management Team has placed these PCR's on hold until PCR 13 (Developing an Interface to EFIS) has been approved.

Production equipment has been procured and is onsite being configured. The training and testing environments have been implemented and business objects have been installed in those environments. The previous issue with the development environment has been resolved. Currently research is being performed to determine the root cause of the issue.

A new baseline schedule was set with the approved SPR dated December 8, 2009. The SPR states the end date of the Adaptation Phase as February 2010. In the January 26, 2010 PRSM Project status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Adaptation Phase completion date as June 29, 2010. For the Adaptation Phase, this represents a difference of four (4) months. Additionally, the SPR states the end date of the entire PRSM project as June 13, 2011. In the January 26, 2010 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the PRSM Project completion date as October 13, 2011. This represents an extension of the project by four (4). Given this change in the end date, IPOC has reported the project as "Behind Schedule". For more information, please refer to the **Schedule** section of Page 1 of this IPOR.

Project Oversight Review Checklist for February 2010

Project Oversight Review Checklist: High Criticality Project

This checklist is an assessment for the Adaptation Phase. The end date of this phase is June 2010.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Planning and Tracking			
Have the business case, project goals, objectives, expected outcomes, key stakeholders, and sponsor(s) identified and documented?	X		An updated SPR was approved by the OCIO on December 8, 2009. The appropriate project documents, including the PRSM Project Schedule, should be updated with the new information from the SPR.
Has a detailed project plan with all activities (tasks), milestones, dates, and estimated hours by task loaded into project management (PM) software? Are the lowest level tasks of a short duration with measurable outcomes?	X		The Implementation Vendor submitted a PRSM Project Implementation Plan during the Planning Phase of the project. The Implementation Plan provides a schedule in MS Project for project activities, milestones, and deliverables including start and finish dates, duration, and high level resource assignments for each task.

The Implementation Vendor is using a Rolling Wave scheduling approach. Prior to the end of each phase or PRSM Payment Point, the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans work together to develop the specific activities for the tasks in the next Rolling Wave. The new detailed Rolling Wave Plan for the succeeding Project Phase will be documented in MS Project and will be submitted for State Acceptance as a prerequisite for State Acceptance of the current Payment Point. In October 2009, the Implementation Vendor proposed a new implementation approach to replace the iterative work packages. This new approach involves establishing a series of checkpoints throughout the remainder of the Adaptation Phase. During each checkpoint, configured or customized functionality is reviewed by the PRSM Project Team through meetings facilitated by the Implementation Vendor. In February 2010, the Implementation Vendor delivered the third checkpoint review, which included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in previous checkpoints.

Configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor. Currently Caltrans is in the process of waiting for the Implementation Vendor's response to the feedback. Finalization of interface and conversion requirements has been delayed until the completion of Project Change Request (PCR) 13, which is the change request for the ERP Financial Infrastructure (EFIS) interface. Rolling Wave Two was closed out and RW 2 activities not |

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			completed were moved to Rolling Wave 3. Rolling Wave 3 activities include completing configurations, developing interfaces and conversion processes, testing configurations and interfaces, and developing the training materials. Activities to reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. As a result of this, the PRSM Project Team tasked the PRSM workgroups (i.e. Training Team, Configuration Team, etc...) with breaking down the tasks for their group and identifying tasks and dependencies. On October 20, 2009 the PRSM Project Team held a PRSM Schedule Review Meeting with the workgroups, where the updated tasks and dependencies for each workgroup where presented to the entire PRSM Project Team. Based on the output of this session, an updated schedule was produced which included the updated tasks, dependencies, and resources.
Is completion of planned tasks recorded within the PM software?	X		In October 2009, the Implementation Vendor proposed a new implementation approach to replace the iterative work packages. This new approach involves establishing a series of checkpoints throughout the remainder of the Adaptation Phase. During each checkpoint, configured or customized functionality is reviewed by the PRSM Project Team through meetings facilitated by the Implementation Vendor. Activities to reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. As a result of this, the PRSM Project Team tasked the individual PRSM workgroups (i.e. Training Team, Configuration Team, etc...) with breaking down the tasks for their group and identifying tasks and dependencies. On October 20, 2009 the PRSM Project Team held a PRSM Schedule Review Meeting with the workgroups, where the updated tasks and dependencies for each workgroup where presented to the PRSM Project Team. Based on the output of this session, an updated schedule was produced which included the updated tasks, dependencies, and resources.
Are actual hours expended by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		Actual hours are charged to a WBS and are recorded and tracked in the Department's official accounting system. An overall project WBS list of approximately 2,000 items exists in MS Excel.
Are estimated hours to complete by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		Activities to reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. As a result of this, the PRSM Project Team tasked the PRSM workgroups (i.e. Training Team, Configuration Team,) with breaking down the tasks for their group and identifying tasks and dependencies. On October 20, 2009 the PRSM Project Team held a PRSM Schedule Review Meeting with the

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
	X		workgroups, where the updated tasks and dependencies for each workgroup where presented to the PRSM Project Team. Based on the output of this session, a revised schedule was produced which included the updated tasks, dependencies, and resources. On a weekly basis, current and upcoming tasks are reviewed by the PRSM Project team and the estimated hours to complete the tasks are updated as necessary.
Is there a formal staffing plan, including a current organization chart, written roles and responsibilities, plans for staff acquisition, schedule for arrival and departure of specific staff, and staff training plans	X		Formal staffing plans, including a current organization chart and written roles and responsibilities exist for the Caltrans PRSM Project Team and the Implementation Vendor.
Have project cost estimates, with supporting data for each cost category, been maintained?	X		The latest approved SPR dated December 8, 2009 has reset the baseline.
Are software size estimates developed and tracked?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable.
Are two or more estimation approaches used to refine estimates?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable.
Are independent reviews of estimates conducted?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable.
Are actual costs recorded and regularly compared to budgeted costs?	X		A spreadsheet exists that shows planned and actual costs by month.
Is supporting data maintained for actual costs?	X		Actual costs are obtained from timesheets that allocate time to WBS numbers/tasks.
Is completion status of work plan activities, deliverables, and milestones recorded, compared to schedule and included in a written status reporting process?	X		Beginning in the May 2009 reporting period, PRSM project status meetings have been occurring on a weekly basis versus bi-weekly. During the meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in MS Project for the current phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the current phase. In addition, the status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register. A high-level status report is posted on the Caltrans Improvement Project web database. Status reports go to the Legislature quarterly.
Are key specification documents (e.g. contracts, requirement specifications and/or contract deliverables) and software products under formal configuration control, with items to be controlled and specific staff roles and responsibilities for configuration management identified in a configuration management plan?	X		The Configuration Management Plan deliverable was submitted by the Implementation Vendor to Caltrans during the Planning Phase. After Caltrans and IPOC performed an initial review of the Plan, the Implementation Vendor submitted an updated version. The current Configuration Management Plan, dated 7/19/2009, provides details on configuration management of key project documents and software products.
Are issues/problems and their resolution (including assignment of specific staff responsibility for issue resolution and specific deadlines for completion of resolution activities) formally tracked?	X		An Issue Management Plan was approved and open issues are in the project database. The IT project manager is considering the same tool for managing project changes. Additionally, Caltrans has established an Issues Management Meeting that is held on a monthly basis.
Is user satisfaction assessed at key project milestones?	X		Representatives of the engineering areas and regions participated in the vendor demonstration evaluations. In addition, Caltrans scheduled

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			Implementation Team training sessions that provided the PRSM Implementation Team with an overview of PRSM Methodology and Functionality. Training Session #1 occurred during the week of September 14th. After completion of Session #1 training, the PRSM Project Team gathered feedback on the content and the effectiveness of the training and used the feedback to update and/or improve Training Session #2, which occurred during the week of September 28th. This is adequate for the Adaptation Phase of the project.
Is planning in compliance with formal standards or a system development life-cycle (SDLC) methodology?	X		Compliance with PMBOK standards is adequate for this phase of the project. Five deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Adaptation Phase: Application Installation Report, Data Initialization Plan, Training Role Descriptions and Course List, Training and Documentation Plan and Pilot Plan. IPOC is planning to review each of these deliverables as they are submitted and will provide comments and feedback.
Is there formal enterprise architecture in place?	X		The RFQI describes the target Caltrans enterprise environment.
Are project closeout activities performed, including a PIER, collection and archiving up-to-date project records and identification of lessons learned?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Adaptation Phase.
Procurement			
Are appropriate procurement vehicles selected (e.g. CMAS, MSA, "alternative procurement") and their required processes followed?	X		The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009. Caltrans is waiting on verbiage from the Software Implementation Vendor to verify that the State will not pay maintenance for the add-ins that are currently not installed in the environment but are named in the license agreement. This contract issue has been discussed with DGS.
Is a detailed written scope of work for all services included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed written scope of work is contained in the RFP.
Are detailed requirement specifications included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed requirement specifications are contained in the RFP. Requirements are described in the RFQI and Value Analysis documents.
Is there material participation of outside expertise (e.g. DGS, Departmental specialists, consultants) in procurement planning and execution?	X		Outside expertise and counsel has been sought from DOF, DGS, and consultants.
For large-scale outsourcing, is qualified legal counsel obtained?	N/A	N/A	The project does not involve outsourcing as currently defined.
Risk Management			
Is formal continuous risk management performed, including development of a written risk management plan, identification, analysis, mitigation and escalation of risks in accordance with DOF/TOSU Guidelines, and regular management team review of risks and mitigation progress performed?	X		The latest version of the Risk Management Plan was submitted April 30, 2009. Risk owners have been assigned. A Risk Register was developed and is tracked by the Risk Manager.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Does the management team review risks and mitigation progress at least monthly?	X		Risk Management meetings are being held monthly with the PRSM Project Team where risks and their associated mitigation progress are reviewed.
Are externally developed risk identification aids used, such as the SEI Taxonomy Based Questionnaire?	X		A risk list was initially populated using the SEI Risk Taxonomy. Additional risks are added to the list through input or migration from the issue list.
Communication			
Is there a written project communications plan?	X		The latest version of the finalized and approved Communications Plan is dated 6/22/2009
Are regular written status reports prepared and provided to the project manager, department CIO (if applicable) and other key stakeholders?	X		The Advisory Committee receives a written status report during the monthly Advisory Committee meetings. These reports include issues identified, changes to scope, schedule, cost, problems encountered, and items accomplished.
Are there written escalation policies for issues and risks?	X		Both the Risk Management Plan and the Issue Management Plan contain a risk escalation process.
Is there regular stakeholder involvement in major project decisions, issue resolution and risk mitigation?	X		Implementation Manager meetings occur on a monthly basis. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the District project managers regularly updated on the status of the project and to receive their input.
System Engineering			
Are users involved throughout the project, especially in requirements specification and testing?	X		Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. The PRSM Project Team is being run by Caltrans Division of Project management which is the primary constituency for the system.
Do users formally approve/sign-off on written specifications?	X		The PRSM Advisory Committee is comprised of Caltrans personnel. The Advisory Committee appears to be monitoring the initial planning process. This level of involvement appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Is a formal SDLC methodology followed?	X		The Implementation Vendor is using the SDLC Stage Gate Model to manage the configuration and customization of PRSM throughout the Adaptation Phase. In this model, work packages divide the total effort into a series of stages, where gating criteria must be met prior to moving from one stage to the next. For the PRSM Project, each work package is designed, developed, tested, and accepted prior to completion of the package. This model may have an impact on the schedule, due to the amount of review time for each work package. In order to offset this, Caltrans is incorporating review cycles through the new checkpoint implementation approach.
Is a software product used to assist in managing requirements? Is there tracking of requirements traceability through all life-cycle phases?	X		An Implementation and System Acceptance Test consultant has been added to the team. The level of requirements management presently in place appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Do software engineering standards exist and are they followed?	X		Engineering standards exist and are documented in the PRSM

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			Configuration Management Plan. IPOC will monitor the project during the Adaptation Phase and subsequent phases to determine how effectively the PRSM Project is adhering to the engineering standards.
Does product defect tracking begin no later than requirements specifications?	X		The PRSM issue management system currently is designed to serve as a defect tracking mechanism. Several of the issues already raised represent clarification to requirements.
Are formal code reviews conducted?	N/A	N/A	This is not applicable for this project. However, the PRSM Project Team has planned for formal configuration reviews to occur during checkpoints throughout the Adaptation Phase. In February 2010, the Implementation Vendor delivered the third checkpoint review, which included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in previous checkpoints.
Are formal quality assurance procedures followed consistently?	X		The PRSM Project follows the State Acceptance process for deliverables. There are three types of Acceptance: Acceptance Type 1 – Objective on Receipt; Acceptance Type 2 – Non-Software Acceptance; and Acceptance Type 3 – Software Acceptance Testing by the State.
Do users sign-off on acceptance test results before a new system or changes are put into production?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Adaptation Phase
Is the enterprise architecture plan adhered to?	X		Caltrans is in the process of creating a formal enterprise architecture plan. The PRSM technology solution was requested to be submitted as part of the study.
Are formal deliverable inspections performed, beginning with requirements specifications?	X		The Implementation Vendor is reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report. The requirements clarification report will be completed in the Adaptation Phase. Previously, the requirements have been through two separate review activities: user group review and IV&V review. There is a third review underway by the Project Management team in order to document the As-Is and To-Be business processes. IPOC will continue to monitor this area as the project progresses.
Are IV&V services obtained and used?	X		The IV&V Contract was approved and the IV&V Vendor began work in April 2008.

IPO Report for January 2010

Independent Project Oversight Report

Project Name:	Caltrans PRSM	**Assessment Date:**	Jan 29, 2010
		Frequency:	Monthly

Oversight Provider Information

Oversight Leader:	Greg Thomas	**Organization:**	Deloitte & Touche LLP
Phone Number:	916 288 3232	**Email:**	gregthomas@deloitte.com

Project Information

Project Number:	2660-160	**Department:**	Transportation (Caltrans)
Criticality:	High	**Agency:**	Business, Transportation & Housing
Last Approved Document/Date:	SPR (12/08/09)	**Total One-time Cost:**	$26,078,375
Start Date:	June 7, 2000	**End Date:**	June 13, 2011
Project Manager:	David Youmans	**Organization:**	Caltrans
Phone Number:	916.826.4425	**Email:**	david_youmans@dot.ca.gov

Summary: Current Status

Project Phase:	Adaptation		
Planned Start Date:	May 20,, 2009	**Planned End Date:**	February 2, 2010
Actual Start Date:	July 1, 2009	**Forecasted End Date:**	June 29, 2010

Schedule

Select the statement that most closely applies, measured against the last **Finance approved** document.

Ahead-of-schedule:
One or more major tasks or milestones have been completed and approved early (> 5%). All other major tasks and milestones completed and approved according to plan.

Behind Schedule

On-schedule:
All major tasks and milestones have been completed and approved according to plan (Within 5%)

Behind Schedule:
One or more major tasks or milestones are expected to be delayed. (> 5%)

Comments: A new baseline schedule was set with the approved SPR dated December 8, 2009. The SPR states the end date of the Adaptation Phase as February 2010. In the January 26, 2010 PRSM Project status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Adaptation Phase completion date as June 29, 2010. For the Adaptation Phase, this represents a difference of four (4) months or approximately a 57% delay.

Additionally, the SPR states the end date of the entire PRSM project as June 13, 2011. In the January 26, 2010 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the PRSM Project completion date as October 13, 2011. This represents an extension of the project by four (4) months or approximately a 15% delay.

Given this change, IPOC has reported the project as "Behind Schedule". Please note that the PRSM Project Team is still in the process of determining the overall timeline for the project. While the end of the Adaptation Phase milestone is behind schedule by 4 months it is possible that the project will complete on time (by June 13, 2011). Efforts by the PRSM Project Team, such as concurrent configuration of agreed upon requirements, are currently underway to offset some of the delay in Adaptation. We will continue to closely monitor the schedule status during the Adaptation Phase and report any updates as they occur. Please see the risks section below for information regarding further potential impact to the schedule.

Resources (Level of Effort) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Fewer Resources
Completion of one or more major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) fewer hours/staff than planned.

Within Resources
All major tasks have been completed and acceptable products created using the planned number of hours/staff (within 5%).

> **Within Resources**

More Resources
Completion of major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) more hours/staff than planned.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR dated 12/08/2009.

Resources (Budget/Cost) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Less cost
The project is (>5%) under budget.

Within cost
The project is operating within budget.

> **Within Cost**

Higher cost
Material budget increases (>5%) are likely.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR dated 12/08/2009.

Quality (Client Functionality) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined
Required client functionality is adequately defined, and is being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

> **Adequately Defined**

Inadequately Defined
One or more significant components of required client functionality are inadequately defined, or are not being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Comments: Functionality is adequately defined for the Adaptation Phase which began on July 1, 2009. In December 2009, the Implementation Vendor delivered the second Checkpoint review, which included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in both checkpoints one and two. Configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor. The PRSM Project Team has been made aware that Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system and Earned Value Reporting System (EVRS) are going to be phased out once the ERP Financial Infrastructure (EFIS) has been implemented. Based on this information, the PRSM Project Team has created PCR 13, which involves building an interface to EFIS. PCR 13 is currently under analysis (analysis activities include requirements identification). In addition, there are currently 3 open Project Change Requests (PCR's) that include changes and/or deletions to existing requirements / functionality (PCR 8, 9, and 12). The majority of these changes involve interface

requirements. The PRSM Change Management Team has placed these PCR's on hold until PCR 13 has been approved.

Quality (Architecture/System Performance) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined
The system technical architecture is adequately defined, and modeling, benchmarking and testing are being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Adequately Defined

Inadequately Defined
The system technical architecture is not adequately defined, or modeling, benchmarking and testing are not being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Comments: System technical architecture and performance are adequately defined for the Adaptation Phase. The Implementation Vendor has submitted a Configuration Management Plan, High Level Design, and updated Architecture Diagram. Production equipment has been procured and is on-site. Application installation of the production environment is scheduled to begin in February 2010. Currently, there is an issue with the development environment; the Software Vendor Consultant rebuilt the environment in January, however the issue still exists. The Software Vendor Consultant is currently working with the California Department of Technology Services (OTech) to troubleshoot the issue. This does not have an impact on the critical path.

Issues

Issue Title: EFIS Interface

Issue Statement: The PRSM Project Team has been made aware that Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system and Earned Value Reporting System (EVRS) are going to be phased out once the ERP Financial Infrastructure (EFIS) has been implemented. While developing to one standard interface presents a business opportunity, specifications and data requirements will need to be analyzed and documented. The development of the EFIS interface is a critical step for the PRSM project to proceed to the Pilot phase. Currently EFIS is scheduled to go-live in July 2010 and PRSM is scheduled to begin Pilot on 6/28/2010. A delay in the EFIS schedule could potentially have an adverse impact on the PRSM project schedule.

Impact: High   Time Frame: Short Term   Severity: High   Assigned to: Jacqueline Moore

Recommendations:

- Develop a detailed action plan for the EFIS interface that addresses the following: impact to the data conversion effort, impact to districts and end users, impact to project resources, impact to schedule, and impact to costs.

- Update the PRSM project schedule with the activities associated with the EFIS interface, including analysis activities.

- Continue to work closely with the EFIS project by attending the bi-weekly interface planning meetings. Escalate issues related to EFIS timing and resource needs to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution as soon as the interface requirements are finalized.

Status Update:

Jan 10 Status   The PRSM Project Team has created Project Change Request (PCR) 13 for the EFIS Interface effort. PCR 13 is currently under analysis.

New Risks

No new risks

Progress Toward Addressing Prior Risks

Risk Title: PRSM Task Dependency Identification

Risk Statement: Recent activities to refresh/reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. The identification of these could result in further delay to the overall project schedule.

Probability: High   Impact: High   Time Frame: Long Term   Severity: High   Assigned to: David Youmans

Recommendation:

- During the weekly PRSM Project Status meetings, IPOC recommends that each of the Caltrans PRSM Project Team Workgroups conduct brief and more frequent status meetings regarding status of tasks, dependencies, risks and issues associated with those tasks. In addition, IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team continues to refine the schedule for project phases after Adaptation to ensure that any risk of further schedule slippage is mitigated and so that the total impact of known dependencies on the schedule can be understood and communicated to stakeholders.

Status Update:

Jan 10 Status: No new status

Dec 09 Status: The PRSM Project Team has continued to reevaluate the PRSM Project Schedule during the month of December. During the weekly PRSM Project Status meetings, current and up-coming tasks are discussed and risks and dependencies associated with those tasks are identified. For a status update on the requirements baselining process, please refer to Risk: **Business Rules and Business Process Changes** below.

Risk Title: PRSM Project Team Communications

Risk Statement: Effective, clear and frequent communications between the Caltrans PRSM team, the Implementation Vendor, other vendors (e.g., testing and data conversion), and District stakeholder is critical given the size and complexity of PRSM during the Adaptation Phase. The new Communications Plan, while documented, needs to be fully implemented early in the Adaptation Phase. Without effective communications, the PRSM project schedule, scope and quality could be difficult to manage and control.

Probability: Medium   Impact: High   Time Frame: Long Term   Severity: High   Assigned to: David Youmans

Recommendation:

- In addition to the weekly PRSM Project Status meetings, IPOC recommends that Caltrans PRSM Project Management and Implementation Vendor Project Management conduct brief and more frequent status meetings in order to discuss the status of high priority issues and action items. These checkpoint meetings should be no longer than ½ hour in duration and conducted twice per week (i.e., Monday AM and Thursday PM).

Status Update:

Jan 10 Status: Beginning in January 2010, project risks have been added as a discussion point during the weekly PRSM project status meetings. During this discussion, a select number of risks are discussed, including their current status, impact, and remediation steps.

Dec 09 Status: In October 2009, the Implementation Vendor proposed a new implementation approach to replace the iterative work package approach. This new approach involves establishing a series of checkpoints throughout the remainder of the Adaptation Phase. During each checkpoint, configured or customized functionality is reviewed by the PRSM Project Team through meetings facilitated by the Implementation Vendor. Checkpoints will occur approximately every six weeks during Adaptation. The Communications Plan was formally approved in the month of August and provides details surrounding the methods of communication for the PRSM project. PRSM Project Status meetings continue to occur on a weekly basis. PRSM sub-teams (Training sub-team, Configuration Management sub-team) meet at a minimum of once a week to discuss current and upcoming tasks. In addition to the PRSM Project Team meetings, Caltrans prepares and distributes a monthly newsletter and "Nuggets of Knowledge" memo to the districts. Implementation Team training sessions have been scheduled during the month

of September that will provide the PRSM Implementation Team with an overview of PRSM Methodology and Functionality.

Risk Title: Timing of Interfaces

Risk Statement: With a new Caltrans financial systems project underway (ERP Financial Infrastructure – "EFIS"), an additional interface will need to be developed. The PRSM project is currently planning to develop an interface to the Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system, which is the Caltrans enterprise financial system that is currently used for operations. The timing for development of the EFIS interface is tentatively planned for September 2009, although the specifications and data requirements are not fully documented at this time. The uncertainties associated with the EFIS interface may have an impact on development and testing resources (potentially increasing development and testing costs) and a potential adverse impact on the project schedule (delay in development of the PRSM solution).

Probability: High   Impact: Medium   Time Frame: Short Term   Severity: High   Assigned to: Jacqueline Moore

Recommendations:

- Continue to work closely with the EFIS project by attending the bi-weekly interface planning meetings. Escalate issues related to EFIS timing and resource needs to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution as soon as the interface requirements are finalized.

Status Update:

Jan 10 Status: This risk has been escalated to an issue and will be tracked in the Issues section going forward. Please refer to the Issues section above, **Issue Title: EFIS Interface.**

Dec 09 Status: Caltrans continues to work with the Implementation Vendor on the baselining requirements for the Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) and Earned Value Reporting System (EVRS) interfaces. The ERP Financial Infrastructure (EFIS) / PRSM Integration team is analyzing the feasibility of establishing an EFIS / PRSM interface instead of building the FIDO or EVRS interfaces.

Risk Title: Resource Availability

Risk Statement: Without adequate Caltrans resources working on PRSM, the project implementation schedule could be delayed. While in the Adaptation Phase, PRSM Project Team members should be allocated full time. Individual Resources may need to be identified at the task level in the Project Plan in order to estimate resource requirements and availability.

Probability: Medium   Impact: High   Time Frame: Short   Severity: High   Assigned to: TBD

Recommendations:

- After the PRSM work plan is complete, determine the resource gaps and reallocate effort as appropriate.
- Assign individual resources at the task level in the project schedule to assist in estimating resource requirements. All PRSM project resources, including vendor resources, should be included.

Status Update:

Jan 10 Status: No new status

Dec 09 Status: During the September 09 reporting period, a CA Clarity technical resource was unavailable during the business objects migration to virtual environments. This resulted in a delay of the business object migration task.

Risk Title: Business Rules and Business Process Changes

Risk Statement: The impact of business changes resulting from the PRSM implementation needs to be sufficiently understood, planned for, and communicated to Caltrans staff. If District field staff are not in agreement with the decisions and consequences of changing/standardizing business rules and business processes, it may have an adverse effect on system acceptance and may disrupt work in progress. This could result in increased resistance to acceptance and usage of the system.

Probability: High   Impact: High   Time Frame: Med   Severity: High   Assigned to: David Cordone

Recommendations:

- Implement a formal change management process which will be used for PRSM project related changes. Change management tasks associated with these changes should be incorporated into the project schedule and budget. Changes should be communicated to the key stakeholders.

- Define the process for gaining field consensus on the new business rules and business processes.

- Develop a plan that describes how information on new business rules and business processes will be communicated to the field with sufficient time to get feedback and buy-in.

Status Update:

Jan10 Status: There are currently 3 open Project Change Requests (PCR's) that include changes and/or deletions to existing requirements / functionality (PCR 8, 9, and 12). The majority of these changes involve interface requirements. The PRSM Change Management Team has placed these PCR's on hold until PCR 13 (Developing an Interface to EFIS) has been approved.

Dec 09 Status: Project Change Requests (PCR's) have been created for changes to and/or deletions of PRSM requirements. In December 2009, configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor. Currently Caltrans is in the process of waiting for the Implementation Vendor's response to the feedback. Finalization of interface and conversion requirements has been delayed until mid January.

General Comments

Deloitte & Touche LLP's IPOC contract with the Caltrans PRSM project started in December 2008. This independent Project Oversight Report (IPOR) provided by Deloitte & Touche LLP has been developed in accordance with the applicable standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) as per Deloitte & Touche LLP policy. IPOC has attended various PRSM project meetings throughout the month of January, including PRSM Status meetings, PRSM Change Management meetings, the PRSM Implementation Managers meeting, and the PRSM Advisory Committee meeting.

The PRSM project is in the Adaptation Part B Phase of the project. Five deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Adaptation Phase: Application Installation Report, Data Initialization Plan, Training Role Descriptions and Course List, Training and Documentation Plan and Pilot Plan. IPOC is planning to review each of these deliverables as they are submitted and will provide comments and feedback.

PRSM project status meetings occur on a weekly basis. During the status meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in Microsoft Project for the current phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones. The status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register. In addition, PRSM Change Management meetings occur on a weekly basis following the PRSM status meeting. During these meetings new and open project change requests (PCR's) are discussed by PRSM Project Management and the Implementation Vendor Project Manager.

The Implementation Vendor has submitted an Adaptation Phase schedule to Caltrans, which separates the Adaptation Phase into two parts (A and B). In addition, the Implementation Plan was submitted, which was reviewed by Caltrans, and includes a schedule for the entire project. The Implementation Vendor is using a Rolling Wave scheduling process for the PRSM project where a more detailed schedule is prepared before the start of each project phase. Prior to the end of each phase or PRSM Payment Point, the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans will work together to develop the specific activities for the tasks in the next Rolling Wave. In October 2009, the Implementation Vendor proposed a new implementation approach to replace the iterative work package approach. This new approach involves establishing a series of checkpoints throughout the remainder of the Adaptation Phase. During each checkpoint, configured or customized functionality is reviewed by the PRSM Project Team through meetings facilitated by the Implementation Vendor. In December 2009, the Implementation Vendor delivered the second Checkpoint review, which included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in both checkpoints one and two.

In addition to the new implementation approach, recent activities to refresh/reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. As a result of this, the PRSM Project Team tasked the individual PRSM workgroups (i.e. Training Team, Configuration Team etc...) with break down the tasks for their group and identifying tasks and dependencies. On October 20, 2009 the PRSM Project Team held a PRSM Schedule Review Meeting with all of the workgroups, where the updated tasks and dependencies for each workgroup where presented to the entire PRSM Project Team. Based on the output of this session, an updated schedule was produced which includes the updated tasks, dependencies, and resources. This updated schedule is scheduled to be finalized in January and will include resource loading. Project Change Requests (PCR's) have been created for changes to and/or deletions of PRSM requirements. There are currently 3 open Project Change Requests (PCR's) that include changes and/or deletions to existing requirements / functionality (PCR 8, 9, and 12). The majority of these changes involve interface requirements. The PRSM Change Management Team has placed these PCR's on hold until PCR 13 (Developing an Interface to EFIS) has been approved.

Production equipment has been procured and is onsite being configured. The training and testing environments have been implemented and business objects have been installed in those environments. Currently, there is an issue with the development environment; the Software Vendor Consultant rebuilt the environment in January, however the issue still exists. The Software Vendor Consultant is currently working with the California Department if Technology Services (OTech) to troubleshoot the issue. The production environment is expected to be turned over to Caltrans for application installation in February 2010.

A new baseline schedule was set with the approved SPR dated December 8, 2009. The SPR states the end date of the Adaptation Phase as February 2010. In the January 26, 2010 PRSM Project status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Adaptation Phase completion date as June 29, 2010. For the Adaptation Phase, this represents a difference of four (4) months. Additionally, the SPR states the end date of the entire PRSM project as June 13, 2011. In the January 26, 2010 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the PRSM Project completion date as October 13, 2011. This represents an extension of the project by four (4). Given this change in the end date, IPOC has reported the project as "Behind Schedule". For more information, please refer to the **Schedule** section of Page 1 of this IPOR.

Project Oversight Review Checklist for January 2010

Project Oversight Review Checklist: High Criticality Project

This checklist is an assessment for the Adaptation Phase. The end date of this phase is March 2010.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Planning and Tracking			
Have the business case, project goals, objectives, expected outcomes, key stakeholders, and sponsor(s) identified and documented?	X		An updated SPR was approved by the OCIO on December 8, 2009. The appropriate project documents should be updated with the new information from the SPR.
Has a detailed project plan with all activities (tasks), milestones, dates, and estimated hours by task loaded into project management (PM) software? Are the lowest level tasks of a short duration with measurable outcomes?	X		The Implementation Vendor submitted a PRSM Project Implementation Plan during the Planning Phase of the project. The Implementation Plan provides a schedule in MS Project for PRSM Project activities, milestones, and deliverables including start and finish dates, duration, and high level resource assignments for each task in the project. The Implementation Vendor is using a Rolling Wave scheduling approach. Prior to the end of each phase or PRSM Payment Point, the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans work together to develop the specific activities for the tasks in the next Rolling Wave. The new detailed Rolling Wave Plan for the succeeding Project Phase will be documented in MS Project and will be submitted for State Acceptance as a prerequisite for State Acceptance of the current Payment Point. In October 2009, the Implementation Vendor proposed a new implementation approach to replace the iterative work package approach. This new approach involves establishing a series of checkpoints throughout the remainder of the Adaptation Phase. During each checkpoint, configured or customized functionality is reviewed by the PRSM Project Team through meetings facilitated by the Implementation Vendor. In December 2009, the Implementation Vendor delivered the second Checkpoint review, which included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in both checkpoints one and two. Configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor. Currently Caltrans is in the process of waiting for the Implementation Vendor's response to the feedback. Finalization of interface and conversion requirements has been delayed until mid January. Rolling Wave Two was closed out and RW 2 activities not completed were moved to Rolling Wave 3. Rolling Wave 3 activities include completing configurations, developing interfaces and conversion processes, testing configurations and interfaces, and developing the training materials.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			Activities to refresh/reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. As a result of this, the PRSM Project Team tasked the individual PRSM workgroups (i.e. Training Team, Configuration Team, etc...) with breaking down the tasks for their group and identifying tasks and dependencies. On October 20, 2009 the PRSM Project Team held a PRSM Schedule Review Meeting with all of the workgroups, where the updated tasks and dependencies for each workgroup where presented to the entire PRSM Project Team. Based on the output of this session, an updated schedule was produced which includes the updated tasks, dependencies, and resources. An overall project WBS/task list of approximately 2,000 items exists in an Excel file.
Is completion of planned tasks recorded within the PM software?	X		In October 2009, the Implementation Vendor proposed a new implementation approach to replace the iterative work package approach. This new approach involves establishing a series of checkpoints throughout the remainder of the Adaptation Phase. During each checkpoint, configured or customized functionality is reviewed by the PRSM Project Team through meetings facilitated by the Implementation Vendor. Activities to refresh/reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. As a result of this, the PRSM Project Team tasked the individual PRSM workgroups (i.e. Training Team, Configuration Team, etc...) with breaking down the tasks for their group and identifying tasks and dependencies. On October 20, 2009 the PRSM Project Team held a PRSM Schedule Review Meeting with all of the workgroups, where the updated tasks and dependencies for each workgroup where presented to the entire PRSM Project Team. Based on the output of this session, an updated schedule was produced which includes the updated tasks, dependencies, and resources.
Are actual hours expended by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		Actual hours are charged to a WBS number and are recorded and tracked in the Department's official accounting system.
Are estimated hours to complete by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		Activities to refresh/reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. As a result of this, the PRSM Project Team tasked the individual PRSM workgroups (i.e. Training Team, Configuration Team, etc...) with breaking down the tasks for their group and identifying tasks and dependencies. On October 20, 2009 the PRSM Project Team held a PRSM Schedule Review Meeting with all of the workgroups, where the updated tasks and dependencies for each workgroup where presented to the entire PRSM Project Team. Based on the output of this session, an updated schedule was produced which includes the updated tasks, dependencies, and resources. On a weekly

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			basis, current and upcoming tasks are reviewed by the PRSM Project team and the estimated hours to complete the tasks are updated as necessary.
Is there a formal staffing plan, including a current organization chart, written roles and responsibilities, plans for staff acquisition, schedule for arrival and departure of specific staff, and staff training plans	X		Formal staffing plans, including a current organization chart and written roles and responsibilities exist for the Caltrans PRSM Project Team and the Implementation Vendor.
Have project cost estimates, with supporting data for each cost category, been maintained?	X		The latest approved SPR dated December 8, 2009 has reset the baseline.
Are software size estimates developed and tracked?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable at this point of the project.
Are two or more estimation approaches used to refine estimates?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable at this point of the project.
Are independent reviews of estimates conducted?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable at this point of the project.
Are actual costs recorded and regularly compared to budgeted costs?	X		A spreadsheet exists that shows planned and actual costs by month.
Is supporting data maintained for actual costs?	X		Actual costs are obtained from timesheets that allocate time to WBS numbers/tasks.
Is completion status of work plan activities, deliverables, and milestones recorded, compared to schedule and included in a written status reporting process?	X		Beginning in the May 2009 reporting period, PRSM project status meetings have been occurring on a weekly basis versus bi-weekly. During the meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in MS Project for the current phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the current phase. In addition, the status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register. A high-level status report is posted on the Caltrans Improvement Project web database. Status reports go to the Legislature quarterly.
Are key specification documents (e.g. contracts, requirement specifications and/or contract deliverables) and software products under formal configuration control, with items to be controlled and specific staff roles and responsibilities for configuration management identified in a configuration management plan?	X		The Configuration Management Plan deliverable was submitted by the Implementation Vendor to Caltrans during the Planning Phase. After Caltrans and IPOC performed an initial review of the Plan, the Implementation Vendor submitted an updated version. The current Configuration Management Plan, dated 7/19/2009, provides details on configuration management of key project documents and software products.
Are issues/problems and their resolution (including assignment of specific staff responsibility for issue resolution and specific deadlines for completion of resolution activities), formally tracked?	X		An Issue Management Plan was approved and open issues are in the project database. The IT project manager is considering the same tool for managing project changes. Additionally, Caltrans has established an Issues Management Meeting that is held on a monthly basis.
Is user satisfaction assessed at key project milestones?	X		Representatives of the engineering areas and regions participated in the vendor demonstration evaluations. In addition, Caltrans scheduled Implementation Team training sessions that provided the PRSM Implementation Team with an overview of PRSM Methodology and Functionality. Training Session #1 occurred during the week of September 14th. After completion of Session #1 training, the PRSM Project Team

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			gathered feedback on the content and the effectiveness of the training and used the feedback to update and/or improve Training Session #2, which occurred during the week of September 28th. This is adequate for the Adaptation Phase of the project.
Is planning in compliance with formal standards or a system development life-cycle (SDLC) methodology?	X		Compliance with PMBOK standards is adequate for this phase of the project. Seven deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Adaptation Part A Phase: Application Installation Report, Data Initialization Plan, Configuration Plan (High Level WP1 Use Cases), Configuration Plan (Detailed WP1 Design), Training Role Descriptions and Course List, Training and Documentation Plan and Configuration Plan (Interface Architecture). IPOC is planning to review each of these deliverables as they are submitted and will provide comments and feedback.
Is there formal enterprise architecture in place?	X		The RFQI describes the target Caltrans enterprise environment.
Are project closeout activities performed, including a PIER, collection and archiving up-to-date project records and identification of lessons learned?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Adaptation Phase.
Procurement			
Are appropriate procurement vehicles selected (e.g. CMAS, MSA, "alternative procurement") and their required processes followed?	X		The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009. Caltrans is waiting on verbiage from the Software Implementation Vendor to verify that the State will not pay maintenance for the add-ins that are currently not installed in the environment but are named in the license agreement. This contract issue has been discussed with DGS.
Is a detailed written scope of work for all services included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed written scope of work is contained in the RFP.
Are detailed requirement specifications included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed requirement specifications are contained in the RFP. Requirements are described in the RFQI and Value Analysis documents.
Is there material participation of outside expertise (e.g. DGS, Departmental specialists, consultants) in procurement planning and execution?	X		Outside expertise and counsel has been sought from DOF, DGS, and consultants.
For large-scale outsourcing, is qualified legal counsel obtained?	N/A	N/A	The project does not involve outsourcing as currently defined.
Risk Management			
Is formal continuous risk management performed, including development of a written risk management plan, identification,	X		The latest version of the Risk Management Plan was submitted April 30, 2009. Risk owners have been assigned. A Risk Register was developed

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
analysis, mitigation and escalation of risks in accordance with DOF/TOSU Guidelines, and regular management team review of risks and mitigation progress performed?			and is tracked by the Risk Manager.
Does the management team review risks and mitigation progress at least monthly?	X		Risk Management meetings are being held monthly with the PRSM Project Team where risks and their associated mitigation progress are reviewed.
Are externally developed risk identification aids used, such as the SEI Taxonomy Based Questionnaire?	X		A risk list was initially populated using the SEI Risk Taxonomy. Additional risks are added to the list through input or migration from the issue list.
Communication			
Is there a written project communications plan?	X		The latest version of the finalized and approved Communications Plan is dated 6/22/2009.
Are regular written status reports prepared and provided to the project manager, department CIO (if applicable) and other key stakeholders?	X		The Advisory Committee receives a written status report during the monthly Advisory Committee meetings. These reports include issues identified, changes to scope, schedule, cost, problems encountered, and items accomplished.
Are there written escalation policies for issues and risks?	X		Both the Risk Management Plan and the Issue Management Plan contain a risk escalation process.
Is there regular stakeholder involvement in major project decisions, issue resolution and risk mitigation?	X		Implementation Manager meetings occur on a monthly basis. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the District project managers regularly updated on the status of the project and to receive their input.
System Engineering			
Are users involved throughout the project, especially in requirements specification and testing?	X		Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. The PRSM Project Team is being run by Caltrans Division of Project management which is the primary constituency for the system.
Do users formally approve/sign-off on written specifications?	X		The PRSM Advisory Committee is comprised of Caltrans personnel. The Advisory Committee appears to be monitoring the initial planning process. This level of involvement appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Is a formal SDLC methodology followed?	X		The Implementation Vendor is using the SDLC Stage Gate Model to manage the configuration and customization of PRSM throughout the Adaptation Phase. In this model, work packages divide the total effort into a series of stages, where gating criteria must be met prior to moving from one stage to the next. For the PRSM Project, each work package is designed, developed, tested, and accepted prior to completion of the package. This model may have an impact on the schedule, due to the amount of review time for each work package. In order to offset this, Caltrans is incorporating review cycles through the new checkpoint implementation approach.
Is a software product used to assist in managing requirements?	X		An Implementation and System Acceptance Test consultant has been

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Is there tracking of requirements traceability through all life-cycle phases?			added to the team. The level of requirements management presently in place appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Do software engineering standards exist and are they followed?	X		Engineering standards exist and are documented in the PRSM Configuration Management Plan. IPOC will monitor the project during the Adaptation Phase and subsequent phases to determine how effectively the PRSM Project is adhering to the engineering standards.
Does product defect tracking begin no later than requirements specifications?	X		The PRSM issue management system currently is designed to serve as a defect tracking mechanism. Several of the issues already raised represent clarification to requirements.
Are formal code reviews conducted?	N/A	N/A	This is not applicable for the project. However, the PRSM Project Team has planned for formal configuration reviews to occur during checkpoints throughout the Adaptation Phase. In December 2009, the Implementation Vendor delivered the second Checkpoint review, which included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in both checkpoints one and two. Checkpoint 3 is scheduled for February 2010.
Are formal quality assurance procedures followed consistently?	X		The PRSM Project follows the State Acceptance process for deliverables. There are three types of Acceptance: Acceptance Type 1 – Objective on Receipt; Acceptance Type 2 – Non-Software Acceptance; and Acceptance Type 3 – Software Acceptance Testing by the State.
Do users sign-off on acceptance test results before a new system or changes are put into production?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Adaptation Phase
Is the enterprise architecture plan adhered to?	X		Caltrans is in the process of creating a formal enterprise architecture plan. The PRSM technology solution was requested to be submitted as part of the study.
Are formal deliverable inspections performed, beginning with requirements specifications?	X		The Implementation Vendor is reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report. The requirements clarification report will be completed in the Adaptation Phase. Previously, the requirements have been through two separate review activities: user group review and IV&V review. There is a third review underway by the Project Management team in order to document the As-Is and To-Be business processes. IPOC will continue to monitor this area as the project progresses.
Are IV&V services obtained and used?	X		The IV&V Contract was approved and the IV&V Vendor began work in April 2008.

IPO Report for December 2009

Independent Project Oversight Report

Project Name: Caltrans PRSM   **Assessment Date:** Dec 31, 2009

Frequency: Monthly

Oversight Provider Information

Oversight Leader:	Greg Thomas	**Organization:**	Deloitte & Touche LLP
Phone Number:	916 288 3232	**Email:**	gretbomas@deloitie.com

Project Information

Project Number:	2660-160	**Department:**	Transportation (Caltrans)
Criticality:	High	**Agency:**	Business, Transportation & Housing
Last Approved Document/Date:	SPR (12/08/09)	**Total One-time Cost:**	$26,078,375
Start Date:	June 7, 2000	**End Date:**	June 13, 2011
Project Manager:	David Youmans	**Organization:**	Caltrans
Phone Number:	916.826.4425	**Email:**	david_youmans@dot.ca.gov

---

Summary: Current Status

Project Phase:	Adaptation		
Planned Start Date:	May 20,, 2009	**Planned End Date:**	February 2, 2010
Actual Start Date:	July 1, 2009	**Forecasted End Date:**	June 28, 2010

Schedule

Select the statement that most closely applies, measured against the last **Finance approved** document.

Ahead-of-schedule:
One or more major tasks or milestones have been completed and approved early (> 5%) All other major tasks and milestones completed and approved according to plan.

Behind Schedule

On-schedule:
All major tasks and milestones have been completed and approved according to plan. (Within 5%)

Behind Schedule:
One or more major tasks or milestones are expected to be delayed. (> 5%)

Comments: A new baseline schedule was set with the approved SPR dated December 8, 2009. The SPR states the end date of the Adaptation Phase as February 2010. In the November 24, 2009 PRSM Project status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Adaptation Phase completion date as June 28, 2010. For the Adaptation Phase, this represents a difference of four (4) months or approximately a 57% delay.

Additionally, the SPR states the end date of the entire PRSM project as June 13, 2011. In the November 24, 2009 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the PRSM Project completion date as October 13, 2011. This represents an extension of the project by four (4) months or approximately a 15% delay.

Given this change, IPOC has reported the project as "Behind Schedule". Please note that the PRSM Project Team is still in the process of determining the overall timeline for the project. While the end of the Adaptation Phase milestone is behind schedule by 4 months it is possible that the project will complete on time (by June 13, 2011). Efforts by the PRSM Project Team, such as concurrent configuration of agreed upon requirements, are currently underway to offset some of the delay in Adaptation. We will continue to closely monitor the schedule status during the Adaptation Phase and report any updates as they occur. Please see the risks section below for information regarding further potential impact to the schedule.

Resources (Level of Effort) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Fewer Resources
Completion of one or more major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) fewer hours/staff than planned.

Within Resources
All major tasks have been completed and acceptable products created using the planned number of hours/staff (within 5%).

Within Resources

More Resources
Completion of major tasks and/or acceptable products has required or is expected to require materially (>5%) more hours/staff than planned.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR dated 12/08/2009.

Resources (Budget/Cost) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Less cost
The project is (>5%) under budget.

Within cost
The project is operating within budget.

Within Cost

Higher cost
Material budget increases (>5%) are likely.

Comments: A new baseline was set with the approved SPR dated 12/08/2009.

Quality (Client Functionality) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined
Required client functionality is adequately defined, and is being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Adequately Defined

Inadequately Defined
One or more significant components of required client functionality are inadequately defined or are not being successfully built into the system, given the current project phase.

Comments: Functionality is adequately defined for the Adaptation Phase which began on July 1, 2009. In December 2009, the Implementation Vendor delivered the second Checkpoint review, which included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in both checkpoints one and two. Configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor. Currently Caltrans is in the process of waiting for the Implementation Vendor's response to the feedback. Finalization of interface and conversion requirements has been delayed until mid January.

Quality (Architecture/System Performance) Choose the statement that most closely applies.

Adequately Defined
The system technical architecture is adequately defined, and modeling, benchmarking and testing are being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Adequately Defined

Inadequately Defined
The system technical architecture is not adequately defined, or modeling, benchmarking and testing are not being conducted (or are planned) appropriate to the current project phase.

Comments: System technical architecture and performance are adequately defined for the Adaptation Phase. The Implementation Vendor has submitted a Configuration Management Plan, High Level Design, and updated Architecture Diagram. Production equipment has been procured and is on-site. Application installation of the production environment is scheduled to begin in February 2010. Currently, there is an issue with the development environment; the software vendor is scheduled to rebuild the environment in January 2010. This does not have an impact on the critical path.

New Risks

No new risks

Progress Toward Addressing Prior Risks

Risk Title: PRSM Task Dependency Identification

Risk Statement: Recent activities to refresh/reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. The identification of these could result in further delay to the overall project schedule.

Probability: High   Impact: High   Time Frame: Long Term   Severity: High   Assigned to: David Youmans

Recommendation:

- During the weekly PRSM Project Status meetings, IPOC recommends that each of the Caltrans PRSM Project Team Workgroups conduct brief and more frequent status meetings regarding status of tasks, dependencies, risks and issues associated with those tasks. In addition, IPOC recommends that the PRSM Project Team continues to refine the schedule for project phases after Adaptation to ensure that any risk of further schedule slippage is mitigated and so that the total impact of known dependencies on the schedule can be understood and communicated to stakeholders.

Status Update:

Dec 09 Status: The PRSM Project Team has continued to reevaluate the PRSM Project Schedule during the month of December. During the weekly PRSM Project Status meetings, current and up-coming tasks are discussed and risks and dependencies associated with those tasks are identified. For a status update on the requirements baselining process, please refer to Risk: **Business Rules and Business Process Changes** below.

Nov 09 Status: The PRSM Project Team has continued to re-evaluate the PRSM Project Schedule during the month of November. This effort resulted in an updated project schedule, which identified a four (4) month extension in the Adaptation phase. In addition, the updated project schedule also identified a four (4) month extension in the overall project schedule. Note that the PRSM Project Team is still in the process of determining the overall timeline for the project. While the end of the Adaptation Phase is behind schedule by 4 months it is possible that the overall project will complete on time (by June 13, 2011).

Risk Title: PRSM Project Team Communications

Risk Statement: Effective, clear and frequent communications between the Caltrans PRSM team, the Implementation Vendor, other vendors (e.g., testing and data conversion), and District stakeholder is critical given the size and complexity of PRSM during the Adaptation Phase. The new Communications Plan, while documented, needs to be fully implemented early in the Adaptation Phase. Without effective communications, the PRSM project schedule, scope and quality could be difficult to manage and control.

Probability: Medium   Impact: High   Time Frame: Long Term   Severity: High   Assigned to: David Youmans

Recommendation:

- In addition to the weekly PRSM Project Status meetings, IPOC recommends that Caltrans PRSM Project Management and Implementation Vendor Project Management conduct brief and more frequent status meetings in order to discuss the status of high priority issues and action items. These checkpoint meetings should be no longer than ½ hour in duration and conducted twice per week (i.e., Monday AM and Thursday PM).

Status Update:

Dec 09 Status: No new status

Nov 09 Status: In October 2009, the Implementation Vendor proposed a new implementation approach to replace the iterative work package approach. This new approach involves establishing a series of checkpoints throughout the remainder of the Adaptation Phase. During each checkpoint, configured or customized functionality is reviewed by the PRSM Project Team through meetings facilitated by the Implementation Vendor. Checkpoints will occur approximately every six weeks during Adaptation. The first checkpoint meeting was held on November 3. During the checkpoint, configuration designs and the Requirements Traceability Matrix were presented by the Implementation Vendor along with an application walkthrough of the developed configured items. The "To-Be" business processes were not delivered due to the delay in baselining the requirements. After this checkpoint meeting, Caltrans provided feedback to the Implementation Vendor regarding content and approach. The Implementation Vendor submitted an invoice for a partial Payment Point 2A. Caltrans is currently validating that the expected deliverables invoiced are completed and accepted. The Communications Plan was formally approved in the month of August and provides details surrounding the methods of communication for the PRSM project. PRSM Project Status meetings continue to occur on a weekly basis. PRSM sub-teams (Training sub-team, Configuration Management sub-team) meet at a minimum of once a week to discuss current and upcoming tasks. In addition to the PRSM Project Team meetings, Caltrans prepares and distributes a monthly newsletter and "Nuggets of Knowledge" memo to the districts. Implementation Team training sessions have been scheduled during the month of September that will provide the PRSM Implementation Team with an overview of PRSM Methodology and Functionality.

Risk Title: Timing of Interfaces

Risk Statement: With a new Caltrans financial systems project underway (ERP Financial Infrastructure – "EFIS"), an additional interface will need to be developed. The PRSM project is currently planning to develop an interface to the Caltrans Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system, which is the Caltrans enterprise financial system that is currently used for operations. The timing for development of the EFIS interface is tentatively planned for September 2009, although the specifications and data requirements are not fully documented at this time. The uncertainties associated with the EFIS interface may have an impact on development and testing resources (potentially increasing development and testing costs) and a potential adverse impact on the project schedule (delay in development of the PRSM solution).

Probability: Medium   Impact: Medium   Time Frame: Short Term   Severity: High   Assigned to: Jacqueline Moore

Recommendations:

- Continue to work closely with the EFIS project by attending the bi-weekly interface planning meetings. Escalate issues related to EFIS timing and resource needs to the PRSM Steering Committee for resolution as soon as the interface requirements are finalized.

Status Update:

Dec 09 Status: Caltrans continues to work with the Implementation Vendor on the baselining requirements for the Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) and Earned Value Reporting System (EVRS) Interfaces. The ERP Financial Infrastructure (EFIS) / PRSM integration team is analyzing the feasibility of establishing an EFIS / PRSM interface instead of building the FIDO or EVRS interfaces.

Nov 09 Status: The Staff Central Interface Control Document (ICD) has been completed during the November 2009 reporting period. Caltrans continues to work with the Implementation Vendor to finalize the Earned Value Reporting System (EVRS) and Financial Data to Oracle (FIDO) system ICDs. The ERP Financial Infrastructure (EFIS) project has been delayed and is now scheduled to be implemented in March 2010. Due to this delay, the PRSM project team has decided not to create an interface to EFIS during Adaptation. However, the PRSM Project Team continues to meet with representatives of EFIS to gain a better understanding of the EFIS impacts to PRSM.

Risk Title: Resource Availability

Risk Statement: Without adequate Caltrans resources working on PRSM, the project implementation schedule could be delayed. While in the Adaptation Phase, PRSM Project Team members should be allocated full time. Individual Resources may need to be identified at the task level in the Project Plan in order to estimate resource requirements and availability.

Probability: Medium   Impact: High   Time Frame: Short   Severity: High   Assigned to: TBD

Recommendations:

- After the PRSM work plan is complete, determine the resource gaps and reallocate effort as appropriate
- Assign individual resources at the task level in the project schedule to assist in estimating resource requirements. All PRSM project resources, including vendor resources, should be included.

Status Update:

Dec 09 Status: No new status

Nov 09 Status: During the September 09 reporting period, a CA Clarity technical resource was unavailable during the business objects migration to virtual environments. This resulted in a delay of the business object migration task.

Risk Title: Business Rules and Business Process Changes

Risk Statement: The impact of business changes resulting from the PRSM implementation needs to be sufficiently understood, planned for, and communicated to Caltrans staff. If District field staff are not in agreement with the decisions and consequences of changing/standardizing business rules and business processes, it may have an adverse effect on system acceptance and may disrupt work in progress. This could result in increased resistance to acceptance and usage of the system.

Probability: High   Impact: High   Time Frame: Med   Severity: High   Assigned to: David Cordone

Recommendations:

- Implement a formal change management process which will be used for PRSM project related changes. Change management tasks associated with these changes should be incorporated into the project schedule and budget. Changes should be communicated to the key stakeholders.
- Define the process for gaining field consensus on the new business rules and business processes.
- Develop a plan that describes how information on new business rules and business processes will be communicated to the field with sufficient time to get feedback and buy-in.

Status Update:

Dec 09 Status: Project Change Requests (PCR's) have been created for changes to and/or deletions of PRSM requirements. In December 2009, configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor. Currently Caltrans is in the process of waiting for the Implementation Vendor's response to the feedback. Finalization of interface and conversion requirements has been delayed until mid January.

Nov 09 Status: There has been a delay in the baselining of requirements. The completed requirements have been migrated into a requirement management system (Req. Pro). The remaining open requirements are scheduled to be completed in December. During the July reporting period, the Draft 'To Be' business process documentation was sent to the Implementation Managers for review and feedback. The PRSM Project Team scheduled meetings with the Implementation Managers to walkthrough the 'To Be' process documentation the weeks of 7/20 and 7/27. In addition, the list of requirements customizations was drafted. The PRSM Project Team held Joint Application Development (JAD) sessions to go over the customizations list. Caltrans is currently in the process of finalizing the customizations. The Implementation Vendor is concerned that Caltrans is still developing business requirements for EVRS which could result in data model changes later. The magnitude of historical financial data to be converted could have significant impacts and may be considered out of scope for PRSM.

General Comments

Deloitte & Touche LLP's IPOC contract with the Caltrans PRSM project started in December 2008. This Independent Project Oversight Report (IPOR) provided by Deloitte & Touche LLP has been developed in accordance with the applicable standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) as per Deloitte & Touche LLP policy. IPOC has attended various PRSM project meetings throughout the month of December, including PRSM Status meetings. Please note that the December PRSM Steering Committee meeting was cancelled.

The PRSM project is in the Adaptation Part B Phase of the project. Seven deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Adaptation Phase: Application Installation Report, Data Initialization Plan, Configuration Plan (High Level WP1 Use Cases), Configuration Plan (Detailed WP1 Design), Training Role Descriptions and Course List, Training and Documentation Plan and Configuration Plan (Interface Architecture). IPOC is planning to review each of these deliverables as they are submitted and will provide comments and feedback.

PRSM project status meetings occur on a weekly basis. During the status meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in Microsoft Project for the current phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones. The status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register. In addition, PRSM Change Management meetings occur on a weekly basis following the PRSM status meeting. During these meetings new and open project change requests (PCR's) are discussed by PRSM Project Management and the Implementation Vendor Project Manager.

The Implementation Vendor has submitted an Adaptation Phase schedule to Caltrans, which separates the Adaptation Phase into two parts (A and B). In addition, the Implementation Plan was submitted, which was reviewed by Caltrans, and includes a schedule for the entire project. The Implementation Vendor is using a Rolling Wave scheduling process for the PRSM project where a more detailed schedule is prepared before the start of each project phase. Prior to the end of each phase or PRSM Payment Point, the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans will work together to develop the specific activities for the tasks in the next Rolling Wave. In October 2009, the Implementation Vendor proposed a new implementation approach to replace the iterative work package approach. This new approach involves establishing a series of checkpoints throughout the remainder of the Adaptation Phase. During each checkpoint, configured or customized functionality is reviewed by the PRSM Project Team through meetings facilitated by the Implementation Vendor. In December 2009, the Implementation Vendor delivered the second Checkpoint review, which included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in both checkpoints one and two.

In addition to the new implementation approach, recent activities to refresh/reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. As a result of this, the PRSM Project Team tasked the individual PRSM workgroups (i.e. Training Team, Configuration Team, etc...) with break down the tasks for their group and identifying tasks and dependencies. On October 20, 2009 the PRSM Project Team held a PRSM Schedule Review Meeting with all of the workgroups, where the updated tasks and dependencies for each workgroup where presented to the entire PRSM Project Team. Based on the output of this session, an updated schedule was produced which includes the updated tasks, dependencies, and resources. This updated schedule is scheduled to be finalized in January and will include resource loading. Project Change Requests (PCR's) have been created for changes to and/or deletions of PRSM requirements. In December 2009, configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor. Currently Caltrans is in the process of waiting for the Implementation Vendor's response to the feedback. Finalization of interface and conversion requirements has been delayed until mid January.

Production equipment has been procured and is onsite being configured. The training and testing environments have been implemented and business objects have been installed in those environments. Currently there is an issue with the Development environment; however a Software Vendor consultant is scheduled to rebuild the environment the week of January 4, 2010. The production environment is expected to be turned over to Caltrans for application installation by February 1, 2010.

A new baseline schedule was set with the approved SPR dated December 8, 2009. The SPR states the end date of the Adaptation Phase as February 2010. In the November 24, 2009 PRSM Project status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the Adaptation Phase completion date as June 28, 2010. For the Adaptation Phase, this represents a difference of four (4) months. Additionally, the SPR states the end date of the entire PRSM project as June 13, 2011. In the November 24, 2009 PRSM Project Status meeting, the Implementation Vendor identified the PRSM Project completion date as October 13, 2011. This represents an extension of the project by four (4) months. Given this change in the end date, IPOC has reported the project as "Behind Schedule". For more information, please refer to the Schedule section of Page 1 of this IPOR.

Project Oversight Review Checklist for December 2009

Project Oversight Review Checklist: High Criticality Project

This checklist is an assessment for the Adaptation Phase. The end date of this phase is March 2010.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Planning and Tracking			
Have the business case, project goals, objectives, expected outcomes, key stakeholders, and sponsor(s) identified and documented?	X		An updated SPR was approved by the OCIO on December 8, 2009. The appropriate project documents should be updated with the new information from the SPR and Implementation Vendor information.
Has a detailed project plan with all activities (tasks), milestones, dates, and estimated hours by task loaded into project management (PM) software? Are the lowest level tasks of a short duration with measurable outcomes?	X		The Implementation Vendor submitted a PRSM Project Implementation Plan during the Planning Phase of the project. The Implementation Plan provides a schedule in MS Project for PRSM Project activities, milestones, and deliverables including start and finish dates, duration, and high level resource assignments for each task in the project. The Implementation Vendor is using a Rolling Wave scheduling approach. Prior to the end of each phase or PRSM Payment Point, the Implementation Vendor and Caltrans work together to develop the specific activities for the tasks in the next Rolling Wave. The new detailed Rolling Wave Plan for the succeeding Project Phase will be documented in MS Project and will be submitted for State Acceptance as a prerequisite for State Acceptance of the current Payment Point. In October 2009, the Implementation Vendor proposed a new implementation approach to replace the iterative work package approach. This new approach involves establishing a series of checkpoints throughout the remainder of the Adaptation Phase. During each checkpoint, configured or customized functionality is reviewed by the PRSM Project Team through meetings facilitated by the Implementation Vendor. In December 2009, the Implementation Vendor delivered the second Checkpoint review, which included the review of the revised design documentation for configurations presented in both checkpoints one and two. Configuration requirements baseline, customizations and deleted requirement agreements were reviewed by Caltrans and feedback was provided to the Implementation Vendor. Currently Caltrans is in the process of waiting for the Implementation Vendor's response to the feedback. Finalization of interface and conversion requirements has been delayed until mid January. Rolling Wave Two was closed out and RW 2 activities not completed were moved to Rolling Wave 3. Rolling Wave 3 activities include completing configurations, developing interfaces and conversion processes, testing configurations and interfaces, and developing the training materials. Activities to refresh/reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. As a result of this, the PRSM Project Team tasked the individual PRSM workgroups (i.e. Training Team, Configuration Team, etc...) with breaking down the tasks for their group and identifying tasks and dependencies. On October 20, 2009 the PRSM Project Team held a PRSM Schedule Review Meeting with all of the workgroups, where the updated tasks and dependencies for each workgroup where presented to the entire PRSM Project Team. Based on the output of this session, an updated schedule was produced which includes the updated tasks, dependencies, and resources. An overall project WBS/task list of approximately 2,000 items exists in an Excel file.
Is completion of planned tasks recorded within the PM software?	X		In October 2009, the Implementation Vendor proposed a new implementation approach to replace the iterative work package approach. This new approach involves establishing a series of checkpoints throughout the remainder of the Adaptation Phase. During each checkpoint, configured or customized functionality is reviewed by the PRSM Project Team through meetings facilitated by the Implementation Vendor. Activities to refresh/reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. As a result of this, the PRSM Project Team tasked the individual PRSM workgroups (i.e. Training Team, Configuration Team, etc...) with breaking down the tasks for their group and identifying tasks and dependencies. On October 20, 2009 the PRSM Project Team held a PRSM Schedule Review Meeting with all of the workgroups, where the updated tasks and dependencies for each workgroup where presented to the entire PRSM Project Team. Based on the output of this session, an updated schedule was produced which includes the updated tasks, dependencies, and resources.
Are actual hours expended by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		Actual hours are charged to a WBS number and are recorded and tracked in the Department's official accounting system.
Are estimated hours to complete by task recorded at least monthly within PM software?	X		Activities to refresh/reevaluate the schedule have resulted in a significant number of previous unknown dependencies between interface development activities, configuration activities, and data conversion activities. As a result of this, the PRSM Project Team tasked the individual PRSM workgroups (i.e. Training Team, Configuration Team, etc...) with breaking down the tasks for their group and identifying tasks and dependencies. On October 20, 2009 the PRSM Project Team held a PRSM Schedule Review Meeting with all of the workgroups, where the updated tasks and dependencies for each workgroup where presented to the entire PRSM Project Team. Based on the output of this session, an updated schedule was produced which includes the updated tasks, dependencies, and resources. On a weekly basis, current and upcoming tasks are reviewed by the PRSM Project team and the estimated hours to complete the tasks are updated as necessary.

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Is there a formal staffing plan, including a current organization chart, written roles and responsibilities, plans for staff acquisition, schedule for arrival and departure of specific staff, and staff training plans.	X		Formal staffing plans, including a current organization chart and written roles and responsibilities exist for the Caltrans PRSM Project Team and the Implementation Vendor.
Have project cost estimates, with supporting data for each cost category, been maintained?	X		The latest approved SPR dated December 8, 2009 has reset the baseline.
Are software size estimates developed and tracked?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable at this point of the project.
Are two or more estimation approaches used to refine estimates?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable at this point of the project.
Are independent reviews of estimates conducted?	N/A	N/A	This item is not applicable at this point of the project.
Are actual costs recorded and regularly compared to budgeted costs?	X		A spreadsheet exists that shows planned and actual costs by month.
Is supporting data maintained for actual costs?	X		Actual costs are obtained from timesheets that allocate time to WBS numbers/tasks.
Is completion status of work plan activities, deliverables, and milestones recorded, compared to schedule and included in a written status reporting process?	X		Beginning in the May 2009 reporting period, PRSM project status meetings have been occurring on a weekly basis versus bi-weekly. During the meetings, the Implementation Vendor distributes an updated status report, which includes an updated schedule in MS Project for the current phase. The schedule provides a detailed view of the status of activities, deliverables, and milestones for the current phase. In addition, the status report also includes a Past Due Task Status Register and an Action Item / Decision Register. A high-level status report is posted on the Caltrans Improvement Project web database. Status reports go to the Legislature quarterly.
Are key specification documents (e.g. contracts, requirement specifications and/or contract deliverables) and software products under formal configuration control, with items to be controlled and specific staff roles and responsibilities for configuration management identified in a configuration management plan?	X		The Configuration Management Plan deliverable was submitted by the Implementation Vendor to Caltrans during the Planning Phase. After Caltrans and IPOC performed an initial review of the Plan, the Implementation Vendor submitted an updated version. The current Configuration Management Plan, dated 7/19/2009, provides details on configuration management of key project documents and software products.
Are issues/problems and their resolution (including assignment of specific staff responsibility for issue resolution and specific deadlines for completion of resolution activities), formally tracked?	X		An Issue Management Plan was approved and open issues are in the project database. The IT project manager is considering the same tool for managing project changes. Additionally, Caltrans has established an Issues Management Meeting that is held on a monthly basis.
Is user satisfaction assessed at key project milestones?	X		Representatives of the engineering areas and regions participated in the vendor demonstration evaluations. In addition, Caltrans scheduled Implementation Team training sessions that provided the PRSM Implementation Team with an overview of PRSM Methodology and Functionality. Training Session #1 occurred during the week of September 14th. After completion of Session #1 training, the PRSM Project Team gathered feedback on the content and the effectiveness of the training and used the feedback to update and/or improve Training Session #2, which occurred during the week of September 28th. This is adequate for the Adaptation Phase of the project.
Is planning in compliance with formal standards or a system	X		Compliance with PMBOK standards is adequate for this phase of the

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
development life-cycle (SDLC) methodology?			project. Seven deliverables have been identified to be completed during the Adaptation Part A Phase: Application Installation Report, Data Initialization Plan, Configuration Plan (High Level WP1 Use Cases), Configuration Plan (Detailed WP1 Design), Training Role Descriptions and Course List, Training and Documentation Plan and Configuration Plan (Interface Architecture). IPOC is planning to review each of these deliverables as they are submitted and will provide comments and feedback.
Is there formal enterprise architecture in place?	X		The RFQI describes the target Caltrans enterprise environment.
Are project closeout activities performed, including a PIER, collection and archiving up-to-date project records and identification of lessons learned?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Adaptation Phase.
Procurement			
Are appropriate procurement vehicles selected (e.g. CMAS, MSA, "alternative procurement") and their required processes followed?	X		The final contract was signed by the Implementation Vendor on February 26, 2009. Caltrans received, reviewed and signed the contract on February 27, 2009. DGS Legal reviewed and signed the contract on March 5th, 2009. Caltrans is waiting on verbiage from the Software Implementation Vendor to verify that the State will not pay maintenance for the add-ins that are currently not installed in the environment but are named in the license agreement. This contract issue has been discussed with DGS.
Is a detailed written scope of work for all services included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed written scope of work is contained in the RFP.
Are detailed requirement specifications included in solicitation documents?	X		Detailed requirement specifications are contained in the RFP. Requirements are described in the RFQI and Value Analysis documents.
Is there material participation of outside expertise (e.g. DGS, Departmental specialists, consultants) in procurement planning and execution?	X		Outside expertise and counsel has been sought from DOF, DGS, and consultants.
For large-scale outsourcing, is qualified legal counsel obtained?	N/A	N/A	The project does not involve outsourcing as currently defined.
Risk Management			
Is formal continuous risk management performed, including development of a written risk management plan, identification, analysis, mitigation and escalation of risks in accordance with DOF/TOSU Guidelines, and regular management team review of risks and mitigation progress performed?	X		The latest version of the Risk Management Plan was submitted April 30, 2009. Risk owners have been assigned. A Risk Register was developed and is tracked by the Risk Manager.
Does the management team review risks and mitigation progress at least monthly?	X		Risk Management meetings are being held monthly with the PRSM Project Team where risks and their associated mitigation progress are reviewed.
Are externally developed risk identification aids used, such as the SEI Taxonomy Based Questionnaire?	X		A risk list was initially populated using the SEI Risk Taxonomy. Additional risks are added to the list through input or migration from the issue list.
Communication			

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
Is there a written project communications plan?	X		The latest version of the finalized and approved Communications Plan is dated 6/22/2009.
Are regular written status reports prepared and provided to the project manager, department CIO (if applicable) and other key stakeholders?	X		The Advisory Committee receives a written status report during the monthly Advisory Committee meetings. These reports include issues identified, changes to scope, schedule, cost, problems encountered, and items accomplished.
Are there written escalation policies for issues and risks?	X		Both the Risk Management Plan and the Issue Management Plan contain a risk escalation process.
Is there regular stakeholder involvement in major project decisions, issue resolution and risk mitigation?	X		Implementation Manager meetings occur on a monthly basis. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the District project managers regularly updated on the status of the project and to receive their input.
System Engineering			
Are users involved throughout the project, especially in requirements specification and testing?	X		Representatives of key stakeholder groups participated in and reviewed the Value Analysis Report that describes the PRSM requirements. The PRSM Project Team is being run by Caltrans Division of Project management which is the primary constituency for the system.
Do users formally approve/sign-off on written specifications?	X		The PRSM Advisory Committee is comprised of Caltrans personnel. The Advisory Committee appears to be monitoring the initial planning process. This level of involvement appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Is a formal SDLC methodology followed?	X		The Implementation Vendor is using the SDLC Stage Gate Model to manage the configuration and customization of PRSM throughout the Adaptation Phase. In this model, work packages divide the total effort into a series of stages, where gating criteria must be met prior to moving from one stage to the next. For the PRSM Project, each work package is designed, developed, tested, and accepted prior to completion of the package. This model may have an impact on the schedule, due to the amount of review time for each work package. In order to offset this, Caltrans is incorporating review cycles through the new checkpoint implementation approach.
Is a software product used to assist in managing requirements? Is there tracking of requirements traceability through all life-cycle phases?	X		An Implementation and System Acceptance Test consultant has been added to the team. The level of requirements management presently in place appears to be appropriate for the current phase of the project.
Do software engineering standards exist and are they followed?	X		Engineering standards exist and are documented in the PRSM Configuration Management Plan. IPOC will monitor the project during the Adaptation Phase and subsequent phases to determine how effectively the PRSM Project is adhering to the engineering standards.
Does product defect tracking begin no later than requirements specifications?	X		The PRSM issue management system currently is designed to serve as a defect tracking mechanism. Several of the issues already raised represent clarification to requirements.
Are formal code reviews conducted?	N/A	N/A	This is not applicable for this phase of the project. However, the PRSM Project Team has planned for formal code reviews for the customizations to

Practices and Products	Adequate	Deficient	Notes: Items Reviewed; Interviews Conducted; Demonstration
			occur in the Work Package Development portion of the project.
Are formal quality assurance procedures followed consistently?	X		The PRSM Project follows the State Acceptance process for deliverables. There are three types of Acceptance: Acceptance Type 1 – Objective on Receipt; Acceptance Type 2 – Non-Software Acceptance; and Acceptance Type 3 – Software Acceptance Testing by the State.
Do users sign-off on acceptance test results before a new system or changes are put into production?	N/A	N/A	Project is in the Adaptation Phase
Is the enterprise architecture plan adhered to?	X		Caltrans is in the process of creating a formal enterprise architecture plan. The PRSM technology solution was requested to be submitted as part of the study.
Are formal deliverable inspections performed, beginning with requirements specifications?	X		The Implementation Vendor is reviewing the requirements and will be working with Caltrans to create a requirements clarification report. The requirements clarification report will be completed in the Adaptation Phase. Previously, the requirements have been through two separate review activities: user group review and IV&V review. There is a third review underway by the Project Management team in order to document the As-Is and To-Be business processes. IPOC will continue to monitor this area as the project progresses.
Are IV&V services obtained and used?	X		The IV&V Contract was approved and the IV&V Vendor began work in April 2008.

	Risk Title	Risk Mitigation Summary	Page
1	PRSM Task Dependency Identification	The project work plan combines both Caltrans activities and Vendor activities in an attempt to identify task dependencies. Both parties take steps to further refine larger tasks into dependent smaller ones in an effort to identify dependencies between activities that involve both Caltrans and the Vendor.	4 of 38
2	PRSM Project Team Communications	Caltrans and the Vendor have a weekly status meeting to discuss the project schedule, issues and action items. Meetings are also scheduled on an as-needed basis to facilitate the resolution of issues and action items. To effectively communicate with project stakeholders, Caltrans has implemented the approved project Communications Plan. Monthly Implementation Managers meetings have been reformatted to provide more effective communication to the Districts. A monthly newsletter is distributed to the entire project team and selected stakeholders. The Vendor has implemented checkpoints to allow for feedback on the Adaptation process. Risk management issues have been added as a regular item to the weekly status meetings.	4 of 38
3	Resource Availability	Caltrans has incorporated resource assignments in its PRSM project work plan that is integrated with the Vendor's effort. Further schedule refinements identify necessary resources. At this time there do not appear to be any Caltrans resource availability issues.	5 of 38
4	Business Rules and Business Process Changes	Change management defines the formal process for implementing project related changes. Issues and changes are a standard agenda item at the monthly Implementation Managers meeting. Risk management issues have been added as a regular item to the weekly status meetings.	5 of 38