

# State of California



## FI\$Cal System Implementation

### Post Implementation Evaluation Report (PIER) - Pre-Wave Implementation

Version 0.06

March 2014

---



## REVISION HISTORY

Date	Version	Last Updated By	Status/Comments	Change Approved By
11/18/2013	0.1	Mark Wallace	Initial draft document	
11/19/2013	0.2	Brian Moss	Initial review with suggested changes	
01/07/2013	0.3	Mark Wallace	Revised Lessons Learned and updated financial information	
01/08/2013	0.4	Mark Wallace	Ready for first peer review	
01/14/2014	0.5	Eunice Malley	Technical Writer review	
03/05/2014	0.6	Mark Wallace	Accepted Tech Writer changes, updated Objectives, and Lessons Learned tables	



**FI\$Cal Implementation Approval**

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

<Sponsor Name> \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
<Sponsor Title> \_\_\_\_\_

Comment [Eunice1]: Todd J?

DRAFT



## Table of Contents

<b>REVISION HISTORY</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>FISCAL SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>1. BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>5</b>
1.1 SPECIAL PROJECT REPORT 4 .....	6
1.2 IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH .....	6
1.2.1 <i>Pre-Wave</i> .....	6
1.2.2 <i>Wave 1</i> .....	6
1.2.3 <i>Wave 2</i> .....	7
1.2.4 <i>Wave 3</i> .....	7
1.2.5 <i>Wave 4</i> .....	7
1.3 OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE .....	7
<b>2. SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>7</b>
2.1 COMPLETION OF PRE-WAVE .....	7
<b>3. ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES</b> .....	<b>9</b>
3.1 FISCAL OBJECTIVES .....	9
3.2 PRE-WAVE TARGETED WORK EFFORT .....	13
<b>4. LESSONS LEARNED</b> .....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
<b>5. CORRECTIVE ACTIONS</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>6. PROJECT MANAGEMENT SCHEDULE</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>7. ECONOMIC SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>20</b>
ATTACHMENT A: LESSONS LEARNED FOR FISCAL .....	21



## FI\$CAL SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION

### 1. BACKGROUND

In 2005, the Department of Finance (DOF) developed a Feasibility Study Report (FSR) that proposed the implementation of a commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) Budget Information System (BIS)<sup>1</sup> to meet statewide and departmental<sup>2</sup> budget development and budget administration needs. Collaboration and discussions with the project stakeholders brought into sharp focus the need to consolidate and modernize the State's entire financial management process into a single financial management system. The BIS project soon became the Financial Information System for California (FI\$Cal" when referring to the System; the "Project" when referring to the FI\$Cal Project Team ). FI\$Cal is a partnership between the agencies responsible for the State's financial management: DOF, the State Controller's Office (SCO), the State Treasurer's Office (STO), and the Department of General Services (DGS), collectively known as the Partner Agencies.

In January 2009, the Project contracted with Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) expert, Grant Thornton, LLP, to conduct a review in the context of best practices for planning and implementing a large ERP project. The Project Review included the following tasks: (1) review the proposed project objectives (2) review the FI\$Cal business requirements (3) review the project organization and governance structure (4) review the project implementation approach (5) recommend the best sourcing strategy within the existing FI\$Cal procurement approach.

The Project Review did not change the overall Project scope, but recommended the proposed implementation strategy be revised to reduce the initial development costs and mitigate risks by reducing the functionality deployed in the first implementation. The Project Review also recommended the sourcing strategy be changed to a two-stage procurement approach, which the Project adopted.

In Stage 1 of the procurement, the State awarded three Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) contracts to the highest scoring bidders based on the selection criteria defined in the Request for Proposal (RFP) FI\$Cal 8860-30.

In Stage 2, each of the three selected contractors conducted a Fit/Gap Analysis to identify potential gaps between their proposed software and the State's business requirements. Each contractor used this information to estimate the effort required to "fit" its solution to meet the needs of the State, while ensuring the State is able to use the best practices and efficient processes incorporated in the proposed solution. Further, the Fit/Gap Analysis allowed the Stage 2 contractors to gain a thorough understanding of the State's needs to propose a detailed and accurate proposal for the design, development, and implementation of its solution. All three Stage 2 contractors fulfilled the contract requirements and submitted proposals to the State. In December 2011, after a series of proposal evaluations and bidder negotiations, each contractor submitted their Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the State. The state selected Accenture as its System Integrator. Accenture began work on the Project in June 2012.

---

<sup>1</sup> The BIS FSR was approved July 26, 2005

<sup>2</sup> For the purposes of this SPR, "department" represents any State entity, that is, in title they are an agency, authority, board, bureau, commission, department, etc.

## 1.1 Special Project Report 4

Comment [Eunice2]: Depending on when you expect this to be published...add SPR 5 info to this doc?

SPR 4, approved in March 2012, updated activities, schedule, and costs through system development and implementation. Total costs including planning, procurement, design, development, and implementation (DD&I), and the first year of operations and maintenance (O&M) were estimated at \$616.8 million. This represented a reduction of approximately \$1 billion from the total costs identified in SPR 2.

## 1.2 Implementation Approach

The implementation plan approved in SPR4 includes a planning and pilot roll-out phase (Pre-Wave), followed by four implementation waves, for a total of five waves. As FISCAL progresses through the waves, the number of departments participating in FISCAL increases and additional components of system functionality are introduced. Each wave is described below and in the implementation table following the wave descriptions.

### 1.2.1 Pre-Wave

Pre-Wave set the framework for the Design, Development, and Implementation (DD&I) phase by establishing foundational Project documents, such as the integrated Project schedule and project management plans. Additional work efforts included the following:

- Business Process Re-engineering (BPR)
- Legacy Application Disposition
- Chart of Accounts (COA)
- Master Vendor File
- Requisition to Purchase Order (PO) Functionality
- Transparency Portal

### 1.2.2 Wave 1

This wave provides a broad set of departmental accounting, budgeting, cash management, and procurement functionality to a limited number of departments and the Partner Agencies. Control-related business processes of the Partner Agencies remain the same during Wave 1. This approach means departmental users will be taking incremental steps towards the final end-state business processes, to be fully deployed in Wave 2.

This incremental approach to business process change will ease the transition for the departmental users from the current to the future state since the portion of their process that interact with Control Agencies will still be familiar. Wave 1 users are currently attending business process workshops and training to verify that they are ready to use the new end-to-end business process to be implemented in Wave 2. Roughly 10 percent of FISCAL users will be introduced to FISCAL during Wave 1.

Comment [Eunice3]: Correct?



### 1.2.3 Wave 2

This wave continues the rollout of functionality by deploying statewide control functions to the Partner Agencies, including transition to FI\$Cal as the General Ledger Book of Record, Budget System of Record, Procurement System of Record, and cash management control functions. This wave also delivers full FI\$Cal departmental functionality to a new group of departments, resulting in 30 percent of FI\$Cal users being live on the new system.

### 1.2.4 Wave 3

This wave delivers existing, proven FI\$Cal functionality to an additional 30 percent of departmental users on a mid-fiscal year implementation timeline.

### 1.2.5 Wave 4

This wave expands the proven functionality to all remaining in-scope departments, representing the final 30 percent of FI\$Cal users.

## 1.3 Operations & Maintenance

Although not a distinct wave, Operations, Maintenance (O&M) services and service level agreements associated with the base O&M contract term start once Wave 1 goes live and continues until Final System Acceptance, which occurs 3 months after the completion of Wave 4. After that time, the State may, at its option, start the O&M services.

## 2. SUMMARY

### 2.1 Completion of Pre-Wave

Pre-Wave provided a go live prior to Wave 1 that built a statewide financial system roadmap and implemented automated workflow processing for requisitions, purchase orders, and receiving that demonstrated the benefits of automation to the State. In addition, the Pre-Wave (1) Included the design of the statewide Chart of Accounts (COA), Budget Structures, and statewide end-state business processes for all FI\$Cal functionality from Pre-Wave through Wave 4 (2) Determined and took action on the disposition of Pre-Wave legacy systems, and (3) Confirmed participating departments by wave.. The Project deployed Pre-Wave in July 2013.

Pre-Wave deployed integrated requisitioning and procurement transactions functionality with electronic workflow for Wave 1 departments. Pre-Wave also established automated workflow processing for requisitions, purchase orders, and receiving to demonstrate automation benefits to the State. FI\$Cal was rolled out to the following departments:



<b>Agricultural Labor Relations Board</b>
<b>California Arts Council</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>California State Summer School for the Arts</b></li></ul>
<b>Department of Aging</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Commission on Aging</b></li></ul>
<b>Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment</b>
<b>Department of Fair Employment &amp; Housing</b>

The FI\$Cal Service Center was also established to support and maintain the Pre-Wave production users.

DRAFT

### 3. ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1 FI\$Cal Objectives

Table 1, Objectives and Outcome below documents the overall FI\$Cal Project objectives and the outcome as of the latest date of this report. This table will be updated as needed after each wave is implemented with a final update at Project close.

TABLE 1. OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOME

Objectives and Their Outcome Through Pre-Wave Implementation	
<p><b>Objective 1: Replace the State's aging legacy financial management systems and eliminate fragmented and diverse reporting by implementing standardized financial management processes and systems across all departments and control agencies. For purposes of this paragraph, "financial management" means accounting, budgeting, cash management, asset accounting, vendor management, and procurement.</b></p>	
Outcome	<p>The Project analyzed legacy financial systems to determine which systems will be replaced, retired, or interfaced. The Project executed Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) workshops and conducted Conference Room Pilot (CRP) sessions on the software.</p> <p>Pre-Wave deployment of related functionality was completed successfully on July 1, 2013, as scheduled.</p>
<p><b>Objective 2: Increase competition by promoting business opportunities through the use of electronic bidding, online vendor interaction, and automated vendor functions.</b></p>	
Outcome	<p>The Project completed BPR sessions with more than 60 participants from various departments, control agencies, and the FI\$Cal Project for the <b>Manage Solicitations</b> and <b>Enter and Maintain Vendors</b> business processes. The sessions enabled the Project to define "to-be" business processes for the State.</p> <p>For Pre-Wave, FI\$Cal focused on the design, build, test, and deployment of foundational functionality (vendors, requisitions, purchase orders, and receipts). The Statewide vendor management file (VMF) is up and running in Pre-Wave with approximately 300 vendors.</p>
<p><b>Objective 3: Maintain a central source for financial management data to reduce the time and expense of vendors, departments, and agencies collecting, maintaining, and reconciling redundant data.</b></p>	



Objectives and Their Outcome Through Pre-Wave Implementation	
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>The Project conducted 19 Chart of Accounts (COA) and Budget Structure working sessions with 21 departments. Based on the information gathered, the Project recommended a new COA and budget structure based on the State's current technical and management capabilities, desired improvements noted by the department participants in the evaluation process, and lessons learned from evaluating similar ERP implementations by public sector entities.</p> <p>In Pre-Wave, DGS Procurement Division (PD) bills their customer departments via the State Contract and Procurement Registration System (SCPRS) interface between FI\$Cal and BidSync.<sup>3</sup> This eliminates the need for Pre-Wave departments to submit hard copy purchase orders to DGS as well as PD's data entry of the billing information. The interface also reduces duplicate entries, facilitates error reconciliation, and provides DGS the ability to run reports, including the reports needed for legislative hearings and Senate Cost Control.</p>
<b>Objective 4: Increase investment returns through timely and accurate monitoring of cash balances, cash flow forecasting, and timing of receipts and disbursements.</b>	
<b>Outcome</b>	Not within the scope of Pre-Wave.
<b>Objective 5: Improve fiscal controls and support better decision making by State managers and the Legislature by enhancing the quality, timeliness, consistency, and accessibility of financial management information through the use of powerful data access tools, standardized data, and financial management reports.</b>	
<b>Outcome</b>	The Project implemented, delivered, and customized reports in Pre-Wave to support the Procurement and eProcurement functionality.
<b>Objective 6: Improve access and transparency of California's financial management information allowing the implementation of increased auditing, compliance reporting, and fiscal accountability while sharing information between the public, the Legislature, external stakeholders, state, federal, and local agencies.</b>	
<b>Outcome</b>	Not within the scope of Pre-Wave.
<b>Objective 7: Automate manual processes by providing the ability to electronically receive and submit financial management documents and data between agencies, departments, banks, vendors, and other government entities.</b>	

<sup>3</sup> BidSync is a contract solicitation system and procurement portal used by DGS.



<b>Objectives and Their Outcome Through Pre-Wave Implementation</b>	
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>The Project completed BPR sessions covering the electronic receipt and submission of financial management documents and data. The Project team defined the “to-be” business processes, which were approved by the State.</p> <p>In Pre-Wave, the Project designed, built, tested, and deployed the foundational functionality for procurement(vendors, requisitions, purchase orders, and receipts).</p>
<b>Objective 8: Provide online access to financial management information resulting in a reduction of payment or approval inquiries, or both.</b>	
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>Not within the scope of Pre-Wave.</p>
<b>Objective 9: Improve the State’s ability to preserve, access, and analyze historical financial management information to reduce the workload required to research and prepare this information.</b>	
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>The Project completed Pre-Wave data conversion activities.</p>
<b>Objective 10: Enable the State to more quickly implement, track, and report on changes to financial management processes and systems to accommodate new information such as statutory changes and performance information.</b>	
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>The FI\$Cal Service Center was established in Pre-Wave and can implement system changes resulting from statutory changes that impact the FI\$Cal functionality.</p>
<b>Objective 11: Reduce the time, workload, and costs associated with capturing and projecting revenues, expenditures, and program needs for multiple years and scenarios, and for tracking, reporting, and responding to legislative actions.</b>	
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>The Project began demonstrating the Oracle software during the CRP sessions for the departments and Partner Agencies to see how the software will deliver reporting capabilities to meet the State’s business requirements.</p> <p>In Pre-Wave, the Project delivered procurement-related reports that support the Pre-Wave functionality.</p>
<b>Objective 12: Track purchase volumes and costs by vendor and commodity code or service code to increase strategic sourcing opportunities, reduce purchase prices, and capture total state spending data.</b>	



Objectives and Their Outcome Through Pre-Wave Implementation	
Outcome	<p>BPR sessions for the <b>Manage Purchase Orders</b> business process were completed. Over 50 participants from various departments, control agencies, and the FI\$Cal Project attended. For Pre-Wave, the Project designed, built, tested, and deployed foundational functionality for procurement (vendors, requisitions, purchase orders, and receipts).</p> <p>The Project established the statewide Vendor Management File (VMF) by consolidating, cleansing, and validating the vendor records that were loaded into FI\$Cal for Pre-Wave functions.</p>
<b>Objective 13: Reduce procurement cycle time by automating purchasing authority limits and approval dependencies, and easing access to goods and services available from existing sources, including, but not limited to, using leveraged procurement agreements.</b>	
Outcome	<p>The Project designed, built, tested, and deployed foundational functionality for procurement (vendors, requisitions, purchase orders, and receipts).</p> <p>The Project implemented automated workflow for procurement approvals, including ad-hoc reviewers and approvers.</p>
<b>Objective 14: Streamline the accounts receivable collections process and allow for offset capability, which will provide the ability for increased cash collection.</b>	
Outcome	Not within the scope of Pre-Wave.
<b>Objective 15: Streamline the payment process and allow for faster vendor payments, which will reduce late payment penalty fees paid by the State.</b>	
Outcome	Not within the scope of Pre-Wave.
<b>Objective 16: Improve role-based security and workflow authorization by capturing near real-time data from the State's human resources system of record.</b>	
Outcome	Not within the scope of Pre-Wave.
<b>Objective 17: Implement a stable and secure information technology infrastructure.</b>	
Outcome	Not within the scope of Pre-Wave.

### 3.2 Pre-Wave Targeted Work Effort

The FI\$Cal implementation plan includes the targeted outcomes for Pre-Wave and their actual outcomes as displayed in Table 2, Pre-Wave Targeted Work Efforts.

TABLE 2. PRE-WAVE TARGETED WORK EFFORTS

	Work Effort	Outcome
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishes a statewide Chart of Accounts (COA) and budget structure.</li> <li>Accenture will work closely with the FI\$Cal COA Workgroup and selected departments to build on the recommendations of the workgroup and finalize the high-level statewide COA. The department level, detailed COA will be developed for each department, if needed, in future waves.</li> </ul>	<p>The Chart of Accounts team formed in June 2012 and identified strengths, weaknesses, and gaps of the current COA. This team also gathered reporting requirements. The COA then began design of the new Statewide Chart of Accounts, and concluded design activities in January 2013.</p>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defines to-be statewide business processes.</li> <li>The Project will work closely with Accenture and selected departments to analyze the BPR opportunities identified by the system integrator and the Project. BPR opportunities will be validated with Partner Agencies and selected departments to adopt best practices inherent in the ERP solution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The first activities for Pre-Wave Business Transformation were requirements refinement and solution blueprinting that completed in August 2012.</li> <li>Business Process Re-Engineering efforts for all FI\$Cal functionality began in August and completed in February 2013.</li> <li>Business Process Workshops were completed in January 2013, as well as configuration designs for Accounts Payable, eProcurement, and Purchase Order functionality.</li> <li>Reports, Interfaces, Conversions, Extensions, and Forms (RICEF) design was also completed in January.</li> <li>Process-focused testing began in January and concluded with User Acceptance Testing in June 2013.</li> <li>FI\$Cal Pre-Wave was successfully deployed on July 1st 2013 to <u>five-seven</u> departments: Agricultural Labor Relations Board, <u>California Arts Council</u>, California State Summer School for the Arts, <u>Department of Aging</u>, Commission on Aging, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, and Department of Fair Employment &amp; Housing</li> </ul>

**Comment [Eunice4]:** Seems like you should have a name for each numbered item, otherwise the bulleting doesn't make sense. For example, row 1 should start with Chart of, followed by the bullets.

**Comment [Eunice5]:** Do you want to mention the 2 others that you show in table on page 8? The leg report refers to 7 depts that includes these others. So perhaps for consistency you should add them.

**Comment [WM6]:** Okay, I inserted the other two. I am confused though. Will need to check on what was implemented.



	Work Effort	Outcome
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Defines the disposition (retire, interface, or partially retire) of each departmental legacy financial system.</li><li>▪ FISCAL staff and Accenture will meet with legacy system owners to define the blueprint for interfaces and conversions. Additional detail including historical data and data mapping will also be assessed. A key benefit to the State, in addition to expedited requirement gathering, will be the ability for legacy system owners to be engaged early and gain an understanding of the data requirements for FISCAL. This early engagement will enable the system owners to begin working with the Conversion Team on early data mapping and legacy data extraction tasks.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Outreach for Pre-Wave departments began in August 2012, with legacy systems data collection and dispositions being completed in October 2012.</li><li>▪ Data cleansing and conversion concluded in December 2012.</li><li>▪ Build and Unit test of RICEF objects were completed by March 2013.</li><li>▪ Conversion and Interface testing was conducted from March through the end of May 2013.</li></ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Confirms the departments to implement for each wave</li></ul>	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Implements Requisition-to-PO functionality for selected Wave 1 departments.</li><li>▪ In preparation for Wave 1, Accenture will evaluate the application(s) that Wave 1 departments currently use to issue purchase orders, and in conjunction with the Project, determine which are the best candidates for inclusion in this portion of the Pre-Wave.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Prior to Pre-Wave go live, departments needed to keep all procurement documentation in a paper file and route related hard-copy documents for review and approval.</li><li>▪ On Pre-Wave go live, the first official requisition was posted in the new System. Departments can attach all procurement documents to a FISCAL requisition and purchase order. Reviewers and approvers can see these documents and perform their review within the System, saving time and eliminating the risk of lost documents.</li><li>▪ , Once initial data is added about a purchase to the FISCAL requisition, that data need not be re-entered. The data flows into the purchase order and receipt, saving buyers' time because they no longer need to add duplicate data to purchase documents. The new functionality also improves data accuracy by eliminating dual data entry across multiple legacy systems.</li><li>▪ Departments are able to save time related to the SCPRS entries. Any data required by SCPRS that is available on a FISCAL purchase order is automatically populated into the department's SCPRS</li></ul>

Comment [Eunice7]: Should something be in the Outcome column for this one?



	Work Effort	Outcome
		report for quick upload to BidSync. BidSync will be replaced by FI\$Cal in Wave 2. The type and amount of data automatically populated in this manner will increase in Wave 1.
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Converts selected Wave 1 departments into the Master Vendor File in FI\$Cal.</li><li>Accenture will consolidate and convert existing vendor data from selected Wave 1 departments into the FI\$Cal vendor file. Vendor information will be used for transactions and reporting in support of procurement and accounting.</li></ul>	Establishment of the statewide Vendor Management File (VMF) began in Pre-Wave by consolidating, cleansing, and validating the vendor records related to Pre-Wave functions and to be loaded into FI\$Cal. The Statewide VMF is up and running in Pre-Wave with approximately 300 vendors.
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Implements citizen-facing payment transparency.</li><li>Accenture will consolidate and convert existing vendor data from selected Wave 1 departments into the FI\$Cal vendor file. Vendor information will be used for transactions and reporting to support procurement and accounting.</li></ul>	Implementation of the citizen-facing payment transparency site was moved from Pre-Wave to Wave 4 via CR-00315, which was approved on 7/12/2012 by the FI\$Cal Steering Committee. The implementation of a public transparency web site in Pre-Wave, using legacy data would: (1) only provide minimal value to the State, (2) would likely create significant challenges for data quality and (3) could create unintended perceptions based on a lack of consistent data standards.

Comment [Eunice8]: Is this the same as the VMF?



#### 4. LESSONS LEARNED

One purpose of the PIER report is to document lessons learned. Both successes and challenges encountered by the Project team are openly discussed and summarized in the form of best practices in this report. It is important that these lessons learned be reviewed by members of the FI\$Cal Project team to take advantage of past experiences for all remaining implementation waves. Table 3 below summarizes the lessons learned that FI\$Cal captured during Pre-Wave implementation.

A detailed list of the lessons learned resulting from Pre-Wave implementation activities is documented in Appendix A.

TABLE 3. PRE-WAVE TARGETED WORK EFFORTS

Lesson Learned	Recommendation for FI\$Cal Project
<b>Departmental Readiness</b>	
During Pre-Wave, the Project learned that the departmental FI\$Cal transition tasks require more support from Project staff than anticipated.	The Project has adopted the approach of conducting kick-off or workshop sessions for the launch of major FI\$Cal transition tasks for departments. These events are followed by support sessions available to those departments requiring additional assistance.
During Pre-Wave deployment, the Project recognized an opportunity to develop roles within the <a href="#">DITs</a> for extended FI\$Cal communications and resistance management.	The Project has expanded the role of Change Champions and has tools for sharing FI\$Cal information and identifying and managing resistance from within the champions' own departments.
During the Pre-Wave transition to FI\$Cal, the Project identified a need to establish independent readiness assessment for future waves.	To assist with evaluating readiness, the Project has hired a consultant to supplement the Project's efforts by performing independent department readiness assessments. The goal of the independent assessment is to provide an unbiased analysis of the readiness of departments for each wave.
Interface and conversion activities are a major area of concentration for all information technology projects. During Pre-Wave, FI\$Cal recognizes that the need for additional time and attention is warranted.	The extended schedule proposed by SPR 5 ensures that interfaces and conversions are properly understood, designed, built, and tested to support the FI\$Cal solution.



Lesson Learned	Recommendation for FI\$Cal Project
<b>Control Agency Stabilization</b>	
<p>The FI\$Cal Project encountered and resolved a wide variety of issues related to control agency functions. The Project developed a clear understanding of the complexity involved with re-engineering and integrating control agency functions and the crucial role they play in the successful deployment of FI\$Cal departments.</p>	<p>The long-term success of -the Project will be served by minimizing the number of major departments in earlier waves and allowing a focus on the control agencies. SPR 5 proposes to focus on deploying control agency functions in Waves 2 and 3, while moving most other departments scheduled for deployment in earlier waves to Wave 4.</p> <p>In addition, Wave 3 is extended by six months to allow a fiscal year-end implementation rather than mid-year, as originally scheduled.</p>
<p>The success of the deployment of FI\$Cal to departments is heavily impacted by the successful deployment of control agency functions. By having these functions implemented and stabilized prior to bringing on the majority of departments, the risk of adverse departmental impact is reduced.</p>	<p>This deployment approach will result in client departments receiving the full end-to-end departmental and control agency functions at once. It will also allow the Project to focus the majority of its resources on control agency integration during Waves 2 and 3.</p>
<b>Knowledge Transfer</b>	
<p>The Project recognizes that knowledge transfer between State and consultant resources is essential to ensure that State staff is qualified to effectively provide long-term support of FI\$Cal. In 2013, the Project learned that additional attention must be provided to knowledge transfer activities to ensure their effectiveness.</p>	<p>The Project has identified knowledge transfer activities and a process to help managers and lead staff track effectiveness.</p> <p>During the implementation of Wave 1 end-to-end business processes, the Project will continue to explore opportunities to gain additional knowledge and experience as maintenance activities are put into operation.</p>
<b>Testing</b>	
<p>During Pre-Wave, the Project learned that earlier involvement of departments in the testing phase would have been of value. Some departments experienced difficulty completing <a href="#">UAT</a> tasks within the time constraints provided. In addition, more thorough review of test scripts would have identified gaps in functionality tested and reduced script revision.</p>	<p>For Wave 1, the Project has involved departmental staff in testing earlier and plans to provide flexible options for the departments to perform their <a href="#">UAT</a>. The Project has incorporated unscripted testing during both functional and <a href="#">UAT</a>.</p> <p>In addition, during the development of Wave 1 test scripts, Oversight Consultants reviewed and provided suggestions that were incorporated to improve script quality. The Oversight unit is also observing Wave 1 test execution and test results as the activities occur, providing real time recommendations to the Project leads. All future test activities are planned to follow this model.</p>



Lesson Learned	Recommendation for FI\$Cal Project
<b>Communication</b>	
<p>Communication is a critical element of a large project. The Project's communication during Pre-Wave was good, but could be improved. For meetings, more attention should be placed on refining meeting materials, ensuring the right participation, identifying the desired results, and communicating outcomes. For external communications, the emphasis should be placed on providing timely information and communicating information at a level of detail and complexity that is appropriate for the target audience.</p>	<p>The Project will look for additional opportunities to improve communications across the teams and down to individual team members. This includes refining meeting standards to ensure that the correct participants are invited, meeting objectives are clear, and the resulting decisions and action items from meetings are communicated to the right audience.</p> <p>Material review processes are in place to assist with providing accurate, clear, concise, and timely information.</p>
<b>Schedule</b>	
<p>During Pre-Wave, Project staff did not always accurately record their time for Project schedule tasks. Also, detailed tasks in the Project schedule were not always clear or measurable, and task dependencies were not always logically arranged.</p>	<p>The Project established special knowledge transfer sessions to teach Project team members how to properly update their scheduled tasks. These sessions underscored the importance of accurate reporting of team members' progress towards task completion.</p> <p>To ensure that tasks are clear and measurable and task dependencies are logical, the Project's schedule team is collaborating regularly with other Project team members and is performing ongoing analysis of the scheduled tasks.</p>



## 5. CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

There were no significant differences between project expectations (as expressed in the last approved SPR) and project results. Corrective actions for Pre-Wave are not necessary.

## 6. PROJECT MANAGEMENT SCHEDULE

Table 4, Pre-Wave Schedule below provides the Project schedule for the Pre-Wave efforts. It is expected that this table will be updated after each wave implements with a final update at Project close.

TABLE 4. PRE-WAVE SCHEDULE

Pre-Wave Milestones / Activities	Target Date	Actual Date
Support Technology and Work Environment - Pre-Wave	7/6/2012	7/6/2012
Analyze Business Processes	12/7/2012	2/5/2013
Design Configuration and Reporting Interface Conversion Extensions and Forms (RICEF) - Pre Wave	1/18/2013	1/28/2013
Establish Communication Infrastructure	1/31/2013	1/30/2013
Chart of Accounts Design	2/13/2013	2/26/2013
Prepare Functional and Integration Test	2/19/2013	2/28/2013
Analyze and Design Technical Architecture - Pre-Wave	2/28/2013	2/28/2013
Build Configuration	3/8/2013	3/8/2013
Interface & Conversion - Approach and Definition - Pre-Wave	3/21/2013	3/21/2013
RICEF - Build and Unit Test - Pre-Wave	3/22/2013	3/22/2013
Business Process Reengineering	3/28/2013	3/29/2013
Establish Infrastructure - Pre-Wave	4/2/2013	3/18/2013
Develop Training Materials - Pre-Wave	4/2/2013	4/2/2013
Interface Test - Pre-Wave	5/3/2013	5/3/2013
Build and Support Environments - Pre-Wave Build Phase	5/6/2013	8/8/2013
Build Technical Architecture - Pre-Wave	5/16/2013	5/16/2013
Test Technical Architecture - Pre-Wave	5/30/2013	6/7/2013
Conversion Test - Pre-Wave	6/3/2013	5/30/2013
Deploy Training	6/7/2013	5/24/2013
Prepare and Execute User Acceptance Test	6/14/2013	6/14/2013
Transition to Production - Pre-Wave	6/26/2013	6/28/2013
Execute Functional and Integration Test	9/13/2013	6/26/2013



## 7. ECONOMIC SUMMARY

Table 5 provides Project expenditures for Pre-Wave.

TABLE 5. PROJECT EXPENDITURES

PROJECT EXPENDITURES		
FISCAL YEAR	BUDGET*	ACTUAL
2005-06	\$866,256	\$866,256
2006-07	5,019,665	5,019,665
2007-08	6,237,000	6,237,000
2008-09	5,575,560	5,575,560
2009-10	12,342,220	12,342,220
2010-11	25,762,163	25,762,163
2011-12	38,790,960	21,792,710
2012-13	88,978,046	81,967,543
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$183,571,870</b>	<b>\$159,563,117</b>

\* Source: SPR 4. Represents One-Time and Continuing Costs



**Appendix A: Lessons Learned for FI\$Cal, Pre-Wave**

<b>Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)</b>	<b>Description and Recommendation for Improvement</b>
1	Documentation	Keep Doing	<p>The Deliverable Review process became more efficient as Pre-Wave progressed although increased consistency in review meetings and enhanced placement of subject matter experts (the right person, in the right place at the right time) would further improve deliverable reviews.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Consider working with PMO to streamline review meetings and ensure consistency. Team Leads to review assignments and better align SME's to deliverable content.</p>
2	Communication Management	Keep Doing	<p>The daily transition meetings running up to go-live were valuable.</p>
3	Communication Management	Start Doing	<p>Some meetings were not as productive as they should have been. Lack of agendas and objectives in meeting invites meant individuals were not always prepared and discussion topics were not always well planned. Conversations were not always captured in meeting minutes.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Establish and communicate guidelines for meetings. Ensure that only appropriate and necessary attendees are invited to meetings, and that meetings have clear agenda and objectives. Question the value of reading pre-distributed materials to meeting participants. Encourage focused, open discussion in meetings, and ask participants to leave emotions and personal agendas at the door. Provide an environment that fosters team communication and collaboration and equal appreciation for good and not so good news (don't kill the messenger). Promptly distribute meeting minutes to participants. Provide approved minutes to other interested stakeholders as a means of communicating meeting information to team members not in attendance.</p>

**Comment [Eunice9]:** Mark is thinking about listing just those lessons learned published in the Annual Report to the Legislature, which are much more high level. He is checking with Lisa and Chi on this.

Eunice's suggestion is to provide the high level lessons learned in the body of the document, and have this detailed table in an appendix.

I'll wait to edit this appendix after I hear what the decision is.

**Comment [WM10]:** That's exactly what I did – took the Lessons Learned summary table from Leg Report and left this one untouched



## Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
4	Communication Management	Keep Doing	<p>The cross team meetings are effective and allow Deputy Directors to work through tactical activities, dependencies, and issues; allowing them to focus on key discussion topics.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Continue meetings and look for additional opportunities to improve communications across the teams and down to individual team members. Consider adding CR's to this forum and sharing Executive Workgroup materials across the team.</p>
5	Communication Management	Keep Doing	<p>The Bi-Weekly Status Meeting is a good forum to share key project information to participants.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Review the participant list to ensure the invitees are the most appropriate individuals to attend the meeting AND distribute the report across the entire project team, with all Team Leads adding the report as a discussion topic at their weekly team meeting. Consider combining with the Leadership Meeting.</p>
6	Communication Management	Keep Doing	<p>ODMF meetings provided structure to the FI\$Cal decision-making process by project leadership.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Review the process for potential efficiencies and consider additional involvement by Departments to ensure clear departmental; voice in key decisions.</p>
7	Communication Management	Keep Doing	<p>The weekly schedule meeting increases team member awareness and allows individuals to plan effectively although there continues to be confusion over some tasks and timeframes.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Review communication process for tasking individuals and ensure schedule is available and understood for better context setting and long-term expectation setting. Team meetings were consistently of value and may be a good forum for additional outreach, for</p>



## Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
			context and support on scheduled activities.
8	Documentation	Start Doing	Process documentations were not always available and many of the processes in place, including the configuration management process could have benefitted from a more streamlined approach; the CM form was cumbersome to use. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Expedite finalization and approval of process documentation.
9	Testing	Keep Doing	Customizations were kept to a minimum and Pre-Wave testing conditions were considered good, although a more thorough review of the test scripts would have been beneficial so that gaps could be discovered before unscripted testing began. Early departmental involvement and more unscripted testing would also have been of value to Pre-Wave testing. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> The flexible UAT options were helpful and should be maintained, along with earlier planning, execution and involvement of Department resources in Functional Test.
10	Other	Start Doing	Security Administration - Roles/Data/Process/ID went smoothly although the process for refreshing user passwords was cumbersome. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Consider making the password reset a self-serve option on the portal.



## Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
11	Other	Keep Doing	<p>Set up of the Technical Architecture may have benefited from earlier planning and less general "swirl" across the team. Penetration testing and finalization of the security workflows would have been more efficient with enhanced focus and more timely start of execution.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Continue to focus on planning and overall Technical Team communications.</p>
12	Testing	Start Doing	<p>Scripts were not always sufficiently tested before being approved for Functional Test. In addition, IV&amp;V review was too late in the process.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Include IV&amp;V early in the process and ensure adequate time to review for both IV&amp;V and the approvers.</p>
13	Testing	Start Doing	<p>Changes to the testing environment were not always well communicated, leading to rework when scripts were executed.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Always communicate changes to the test environment to the team so they can understand the impact it may have on writing and/or executing scripts.</p>
14	Testing	Keep Doing	<p>Establish standards/standard phases for scripts helps script writers and helps in developing UAT scripts, minimizing rework. Sharing examples of well-written scripts is also consistent.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Continue to share examples of well-written scripts along with standards and guidelines to ensure consistency across the team.</p>
15	Testing	Keep Doing	<p>The dedicated test room and dual monitors allowed for greater efficiencies during testing. It also helped that SME's were available to answer questions and provide support in real-time.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Continue using a dedicated test room and dual monitors with floating SME support. This allows for real-time responses to</p>



### Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
			questions and encourages collaboration between the testers.
16	Schedule Management	Start Doing	<p>Schedule work effort estimates were not realistic and deliverable dependencies were not always logical. Overall, there was too much work assigned to too few people and individuals did not take care in applying the right number of hours to the right tasks. This resulted in inaccurate schedule progression.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Review most problematic time entries and variances and do outreach to Team Managers.</p>
17	Communication Management	Start Doing	<p>Communication between the Business Team and CMO were not always timely or efficient, creating frustration as requests and information were often made "just in time" and not always communicated to the right people on each team.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> More regular meetings between CMO and BT resources (not Leadership) as go live approaches.</p>
18	Communication Management	Keep Doing	<p>The BPW's and CRP's were well organized and executed by CMO and CMO's increased version control of documentation throughout Pre-Wave was helpful.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Continue planning and executing BPW's and other key workshops. Also, version control documentation so that the most up to date is readily visible.</p>



## Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
19	Staffing	Start Doing	<p>While good collaboration was seen in many places and deadlines were met, there remained pockets of dissention and infighting. It was not always clear that everyone was working towards a common goal and some individuals found it challenging to go into meetings with an open mind and were reluctant to change things from the "way we do it today." There was also a thought that while the All Staff Meetings were helpful, a more consistent message could be communicated if executives were more visible and friendly on a daily basis.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Continue team building and messaging the FI\$Cal goal. Raise visibility of Executive Team. Underscore the need to; listen to ideas for change, find better ways to do state business, be less territorial, cooperate to build a better system, do what we are asking departments to do, follow our core values.</p>
20	Other	Start Doing	<p>Vendor data not cleansed before conversion made the conversion process difficult. It took an inordinate amount of time and manual analysis.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Thorough data cleansing should be done prior to conversion for most success.</p>
21	Staffing	Start Doing	<p>Department Super Users were a great concept but more than one should be selected per Department and the individual should be someone who has a chance of being around for the duration rather than a retired annuitant.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Select at least two super-users per department and backfill as needed.</p>



## Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
22	Project Support Tools (HW/SW)	Start Doing	Make UPK (User Productivity Kit) available to everyone on BT and CMO prior to Wave implementation. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Review licensing and costs, and balance with user needs, with a goal of making UPK available to everyone.
23	Training	Keep Doing	Involving BT team in developing training early and often resulted in quality training materials. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Keep BT involved as training materials are developed.
24	Training	Start Doing	Oracle training was intensive and very in-depth, but it was provided too early and the detail was too easily forgotten when it came time to execute. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Real-time Oracle training or provide a refresher.
25	Change Control Process	Start Doing	There appeared to be reluctance by the State to initiate change orders to develop a system that is more technically efficient. Greater collaboration early in the process may have minimized the need for last minute change orders. Once initiated the approval process was lengthy. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Review the Change Control Process for potential improvement opportunities and identify what in the process may be causing the delay.
26	Staffing	Start Doing	There was confusion regarding the roles to which project team members were assigned. Assigned roles did not always correspond to the tasks team members were asked to complete. Team member roles didn't always match their skill sets. Training wasn't always provided in a timely manner. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Improve communications around work assignments and responsibilities. Review staff skills to improve alignment of skills and roles, and identify training opportunities for the gaps. Improve



### Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
			the timeliness of training.
27	Project Support Tools (HW/SW)	Keep Doing	The CISCO and Oracle HW/SW installations and deliveries went well and while the installations at Gold Camp and Vacaville were successful, the Vacaville Data Center installation proved more challenging as any site visit was required to be scheduled and escorted.  <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Continue to work collaboratively with the State Data Centers and plan sufficient time for any onsite activities.
28	Project Support Tools (HW/SW)	Start Doing	Establishing SFTPs for each department was problematic. The smaller departments were not equipped to set up and/or troubleshoot and often the Tech Team was brought in by CMO after measurable time had passed. Additionally if OTECH support was required, this could add an additional two weeks to resolution times. Lead times need to be realistic to allow for issues with department firewalls, external IP addresses and non-FI\$Cal standard software in place within the departments (Apple, CalNet etc.).  <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Departments would benefit from a customized approach to meeting technical requirements. Closer collaboration and early escalation to the Technical Team should be considered, along with an ISA embedded within the Business Team.
29	Staffing	Stop Doing	The FI\$Cal team is sharp and confident but there is a lot of over and under allocation and staff vacancies. Accenture staffing levels were insufficient, roles were not well matched with their State counterparts, and counterparts were not always clearly defined. In some instances where



## Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
			<p>skill sets were not well matched Accenture staff was not as participatory or vocal as needed.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Greater leverage and cross training across the matrixed organization would allow more efficient use of resources.</p>
30	Knowledge Transfer	Start Doing	<p>In general, training for project team members wasn't well communicated or timely. New hires did not always receive a project orientation and when mentors were assigned, they did not always have the skills and expertise to facilitate knowledge transfer.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Improve communications around planned training. Identify gaps in training and develop a plan to eliminate them. Expand the Technical Team's training options by providing "on-demand" technical training and access to a sandbox where trainees can practice.</p>
31	Knowledge Transfer	Start Doing	<p>Execution of the PLP's is not effective. The activities are confusing and often the Accenture mentors have not received the appropriate level of training to conduct knowledge transfer. This has diminished the value of the PLP's and turned them into more of a checklist item.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Review PLP objectives and ascertain if met. Evaluate effectiveness of knowledge transfer from Accenture to State and reassign mentors as needed.</p>
32	Change Control Process	Start Doing	<p>Change Control for Pre-Wave was collaborative, transparent, and effective. The Change Control Log could have been easier to find and it wasn't always clear how changes moved through the process from department to department and who did what, when.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Move CC Log to SharePoint and provide an education to the project on the process flow of change requests.</p>
33	Other	Keep Doing	<p>Cutover Plan well managed by Accenture. Good communication of status.</p>



## Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
34	Other	Keep Doing	Agencies were initially focused on their individual interests and it took some time to get everyone onboard with the "one-system" goal. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Continue OCM activities to increase awareness and commitment of departments.
35	Procurement Management	Start Doing	Procurements took longer than normal, e.g. LSDA (LSS) Procurement. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Plan for protracted procurements and engage DGS as early as possible.
36	Testing	Start Doing	The approach to testing did not appear to be clearly defined at outset and defect tracking, script progression and reporting seemed to evolve. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Clearly identify what leadership needs from a reporting perspective prior to test activities starting.
37	Testing	Start Doing	UAT Script coverage wasn't as comprehensive as it could have been and more scenarios should have been covered. Negative testing could have been more thoroughly executed too. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Include IV&V early in the script writing process.
38	Risk & Issue Management	Start Doing	Risk and Issue processes continued to improve through Pre-Wave but the identification process and the closure criteria is not well defined and understood. Mitigation steps are not always action oriented, and discussion of risks and issues is sometime vague and non-fact based which leads to risks taking longer than necessary to close. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Continuous review and improvement of the Risk and Issue management process will help identify efficiencies. Ensuring that PMO team members have a more thorough understanding of the business and technical solutions should improve their ability to manage risks and issues effectively.



## Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
39	Risk & Issue Management	Start Doing	Having a Risk/Issues Liaison on the Business Team made risk mitigation more efficient and updates easier to obtain. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> PMO should ask each team should assign 1-2 individuals to act as R&I Liaisons in Waves 1-4.
40	Schedule Management	Start Doing	Task dependencies for Pre-Wave were not sufficiently vetted prior to baselining the schedule and as a result, deliverables were reviewed out of logical sequence. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Ensure adequate time and attention is given to the Wave 2-4 schedule before baselining.
41	Scope Management	Keep Doing	Scope was managed well for Pre-Wave.
42	Communication Management	Start Doing	In general, project communications to all staff were well received and welcome. The monthly All Staff meetings, the Biweekly status meetings, and the ODMF meetings were regarded as helpful in keeping employees informed. However, team members felt there was room for improvement. For example, the team would have liked more information about the success of Pre-Wave. In addition, staff felt that distributing the Biweekly status report to all staff would have provided important information. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Increase the distribution of status reports and provide more frequent and comprehensive distribution of general information. Keep working to increase and improve the communication of project news to team members. Communicating the results of each Wave implementation will allow teams to see their successes and understand where improvements can be made for future wave deployments.



## Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
43	Quality Management	Start Doing	<p>The QA approach has not been clearly communicated. There is a lack of understanding on the objectives and measures and when deficiencies are identified, it is not always clear what standard or benchmark the product is being measured against.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Communicate quality objectives and strategy to project staff.</p>
44	Schedule Management	Start Doing	<p>Tasks in the schedule weren't always clear or measurable.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Functional teams and schedule team should work together to ensure task descriptions are understood. In additions, teams should work together to develop work effort estimates to ensure realistic and attainable timelines.</p>
45	Staffing	Start Doing	<p>The team was challenged by overall staff shortages and lengthy recruitment processes, with the additional burden of working with extended vacations in some areas. When staff were brought on to FI\$Cal there was little to no notice, and the same for roll-offs. This together with some resources having little to no prior project experience led to inefficiencies.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Review staffing levels and expedite hiring as needed. Ensure that appropriately skilled resources are assigned and continue PLPs to ensure staff is getting adequate training to fulfill their role.</p>
46	Readiness	Start Doing	<p>Department staff didn't always understand how to complete their readiness tasks.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Develop more effective ways of communicating tasks to departments and provide support for completion.</p>



## Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
47	Team Dynamics	Keep Doing	CMO collaborated with other Project teams who participated in the support of departments during completion of Readiness tasks. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> To improve future collaboration on support functions, and minimize the increased workload, ensure other teams understand early on: a) what is expected of them; b) when they are expected to contribute or participate; and, c) the value of their efforts.
48	Readiness	Start Doing	Volume of emails and individual "tasks" sent to departments seemed excessive; some emails were sent with errors, which needed to be corrected and then resent. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Reevaluate methods for communicating information out to departments and consider reducing the number of individual emails sent to departments by grouping or "bundling" (one email, multiple subjects) tasks and utilizing the Secure Department Liaison Network (DLN) corner to post information. Improve the accuracy of the emails to minimize the need to correct and resend.
49	Readiness	Start Doing	Some departments did not understand or fully utilize the Master Department Workplan (MDW). <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Share examples of successful workplans from other departments who are willing to share their MDWs, encourage departments to assign an internal Project Manager and share the State Controller's Office (SCO) generic schedule.
50	Testing	Keep Doing	It was challenging getting departments to fulfill their User Acceptance Testing (UAT) commitments; CMO collaborated with the Business Team to offer flexible UAT sessions. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Continue to offer more UAT sessions to provide greater flexibility to departments.



## Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
51	Readiness	Keep Doing	Departments were responsive to CMO's suggestion of increasing the responsibility and training for their Change Champions to improve support for end users. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Build a user support network through CMO Change Champion engagement and action.
52	Readiness	Start Doing	Smaller department staff members are overburdened with transition activities. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Identify the needs of smaller departments. Consider pairing smaller departments with other small departments or larger departments so they can leverage experience and work efforts.
53	Communication Management	Keep Doing	CMO created and utilized both internal and external Project calendars to provide awareness of upcoming activities and events. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> CMO to work with Tech Team to develop a more visually appealing calendar.
54	Readiness	Keep Doing	Escalation path allowed the Project to stay on schedule when issues arose with departments who were struggling to submit responses timely. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> To more effectively manage timeliness of process, prior to readiness workshops, support meetings, and tasks, identify the impact of departments not participating or completing on time and develop a mitigation plan.
55	Training	Start Doing	Training enrollment process did not allow recipients to calendar their appointments resulting in the need for excessive reminders and missed training courses. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Improve process so that notifications can be accepted on the calendar and easily removed if a course is moved or



### Lessons Learned Report - Pre-Wave

#	Category	Analysis (Keep Doing, Stop Doing, Start Doing)	Description and Recommendation for Improvement
			canceled.
56	Training	Keep Doing	Learning Management System (LMS) was deployed and allowed end-users to take web-based prerequisites. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Improve and expand use of LMS to allow for easier registration process, changes to process and reporting.
57	Training	Keep Doing	Core users were trained to use the FI\$Cal System in time for deployment. <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Improve training process by 1) conducting a Department Training Liaison Kickoff to communicate expectations early in the process; 2) provide a "Training Deployment Workplan" (as part of the MDW); and, 3) hold regular meetings with the Training Liaison, either separate or during the Touchpoint meetings.

DRAFT