

**Legislative Finance Committee: IT Project Portfolio
Supplemental Report**

LFC Meeting Date:

A. General Project Information

1. Agency: Agriculture (MDA)
2. Project Title: Agricultural Licensing System
3. Date Prepared: 9/4/15
4. Prepared By: Andy Gray

B. Project Status

1. Overall Health: Green
2. Brief description of current project status
 - *The original vendor (IronData Solutions through an alliance with Montana Interactive, LLC (MI)) left the project in 2014.*
 - *MDA discussed other vendors as possible solutions to the project. The National Agribusiness Technology Center (NATC) grants usage of a USAPlants product license for no charge to qualifying clients. Computer Aid, Inc. (CAI) is the certified vendor who installs and implements the software.*
 - *Project contracts were developed and reviewed between MDA, MI, NATC, CAI and the Montana Department of Administration (DOA).*
 - i. *Contracts were signed in early June 2015 with USAPlants as the deliverable from NATC and CAI.*
 - *MI has committed to making MDA whole on funds that were expended (\$283,295) to the initial vendor of the project.*
3. Major milestones completed so far: *The project scope has been defined and agreed upon. Phase 1 data migration has been completed and development has started.*
4. Next milestone(s): *Phase 1 completion (November 2015).*

C. Scope Changes

Title and Brief Description	Date Approved	Schedule Impact (weeks)	Budget Impact (\$ amount)

D. Issues and Risks

Title and Brief Description	Date Identified	Planned Resolution	Responsible for Resolution

**Legislative Finance Committee: IT Project Portfolio
Supplemental Report**

LFC Meeting Date:

E. Additional Comments

The project is a complete update of the Division's day-to-day business processes. The main components include the licensing, product and site registration, assessments, mobile inspection, enforcement and e-commerce of several programs.

Cost and estimates associated with the IronData portion of the project are no longer included in this report. The 'Original Cost Estimate' includes the estimated cost for personnel during the 2½ year project timeframe, plus hardware and setup costs, plus product implementation costs for USAPlants, respectfully (\$535,147 + \$35,000 + \$566,200 = \$1,136,347). The department has made no payments to this vendor to date. The annual maintenance fee of \$26,450 is not considered in the amount.

**Legislative Finance Committee: IT Project Portfolio
Supplemental Report**

A. General Project Information

1. Agency: DPHHS
2. Project Title: Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS)
3. Date Prepared: 8/31/2015
4. Prepared By: Tim Peterson

B. Project Status

1. Overall Health: Red
2. Brief description of current project status

DPHHS rates the overall project health as "Red". Xerox continues to experience challenges executing the July 18, 2014 approved project schedule resulting in slipped tasks and past due deliverables. On November 26, 2014, DPHHS issued a notice of required corrective action to Xerox that identified seven performance categories that require improvement. On February 10, 2015, DPHHS approved the Xerox Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to improve the seven categories. CAP + 30 days items: A. Documentation, F. Project Management Metrics Portal, G. Project Staffing all due March 12; CAP + 60 days items: B. Design Session Preparation, C. Design Session Execution, E. Project Schedule Management all due April 11, 2015; and CAP + 90 days item: D. Deliverable Quality due May 11, 2015.

DPHHS began evaluating the CAP + 30 measures on March 13, 2015. Xerox failed to deliver the Health Enterprise Platform documentation to DPHHS on March 13, 2015, as required by CAP Item A, due to corruption issues related to the documentation environment. The documentation was not available for DPHHS review; therefore DPHHS issued a Notice of Material Breach to Xerox for CAP Item A on March 18, 2015. Xerox made the documentation available to DPHHS for review on March 24, 2015. DPHHS conducted an audit of a 10% sample of the documentation. Based on deficiencies discovered in that review, DPHHS notified Xerox on April 8, 2015 that the March 24, 2015 documentation delivery had not cured the material breach. Xerox delivered the updated Health Enterprise Platform Documentation and Health Enterprise Platform Environment 90 on April 17, 2015. DPHHS began their second audit of a 10% sample of the Xerox platform documentation for evaluation of CAP Item A on April 20, 2015. DPHHS completed the second audit on May 31, 2015 and notified Xerox that 64 of the 79 (81%) use cases sampled failed. Effective March 13, 2015, DPHHS began assessing liquidated damages for Xerox's failure to resolve deficiencies associated with CAP Item A. As of August 21, 2015, DPHHS has submitted \$141,000 in liquidated damages invoices for CAP Item A to Xerox. DPHHS has received \$110,000 in liquidated damage payments for CAP Item A. DPHHS expects Xerox to redeliver corrected documentation to DPHHS in early September 2015. Once the corrected documentation is received, DPHHS will conduct another review of the Health Enterprise Platform documentation. DPHHS will continue to assess and collect liquidated damages for CAP Item A until this material breach is cured.

Legislative Finance Committee: IT Project Portfolio Supplemental Report

Preliminary review and subsequent reviews indicate that both CAP Items F and G are acceptable.

DPHHS began evaluating the CAP + 60 measures on April 13, 2015. On May 13, 2015, DPHHS completed the review of CAP items B, C, and E and determined that Xerox had failed to successfully deliver each CAP Item. On May 15, 2015, DPHHS issued an additional Notice of Material Breach to Xerox for CAP Item B, CAP Item C, and CAP item E.

Effective April 12, 2015, DPHHS began assessing liquidated damages for Xerox's failure to resolve deficiencies associated with CAP Items B & C. As of August 21, 2015, DPHHS has submitted \$222,000 in liquidated damages invoices for CAP Items B & C to Xerox. DPHHS has received \$160,000 in liquidated damage payments for CAP Items B & C. In July 2015, DPHHS completed a re-review of CAP Items B & C. Based on that review, DPHHS determined that Xerox was no longer in material breach for CAP Items B & C. On August 7, 2015, DPHHS notified Xerox that as of July 31, 2015 (the end of Sprint 19) they had satisfied the CAP requirements for CAP Items B & C and that DPHHS would discontinue the assessing liquidated damages for CAP Items B & C.

Effective April 12, 2015, DPHHS began assessing liquidated damages for Xerox's failure to resolve deficiencies associated with CAP Item E. As of August 21, 2015, DPHHS has submitted \$111,000 in liquidated damages invoices for CAP Item E to Xerox. DPHHS has received \$80,000 in liquidated damage payments for CAP Item E. DPHHS and Xerox continue to have ongoing discussions regarding the Xerox approach to resolving the CAP Item E problems. DPHHS will continue to assess and collect liquidated damages for CAP Item E until this material breach is cured.

DPHHS began evaluating CAP Item D (CAP + 90) measures starting May 12, 2015. Since May 12, 2015, Xerox has submitted 12 interim deliverables and 4 deliverables for DPHHS review. None of these deliverables have passed the CAP Item D evaluation criteria. The 16 Deliverables (interim deliverables and deliverables) are either pending design session review (5), under review by DPHHS (4), or have been returned to Xerox for revisions (7), and DPHHS is unable to complete the CAP Item D review criteria until the deliverables are resubmitted. DPHHS will continue to review the deliverable quality and we expect to have an assessment of the CAP Item D Deliverable Quality by the end of September.

The current Schedule Performance Index (SPI) is .528 and there are 4,297 project work plan tasks that have missed a baseline date. Since July 18, 2014, only 7% (23/331) of the interim deliverables and deliverables (deliverables) have been completed, 83% (276/331) of the deliverables are past due, 4% (12/331) are currently under review by DPHHS, 5% (18/331) have been returned to Xerox with comments, and 1% have been rejected. Of deliverables scheduled to be delivered over the next 90 days, 60% (57/95) are projected by Xerox to be late.

Xerox has not been paid any money related to the contract payment milestones for the MMIS DDI project. The first payment milestone scheduled for November 16, 2015 is the Benefit Plan Administration Iteration Acceptance Payment Milestone which DPHHS has determined is at risk of

**Legislative Finance Committee: IT Project Portfolio
Supplemental Report**

not being delivered per the approved work plan. DPHHS expects the overall project status to remain “Red” for an extended period of time. This status is not expected to change until Xerox successfully executes the approved corrective action plan resulting in a reduction of past due deliverables and slipped tasks and a dramatic improvement in the SPI. Public Knowledge, the MMIS DDI Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) vendor contracted by DPHHS, has reported the Xerox MMIS DDI project performance status as “Red” in the most recent monthly independent status report dated August 27, 2015. Xerox is also currently reporting the project status as “Red”. In June 2015, the DPHHS Project Manager determined that Xerox would not meet the May 30, 2017 full system implementation date based on the following factors: high number of past due deliverables, high number of slipped tasks, lack of design and development progress, and the Xerox failure to successfully meet required dates for Corrective Action Plan items A, B, C, and E.

3. Major milestones completed so far: None
4. Next milestone(s):
Benefit Plan Administration Iteration Acceptance Payment Milestone scheduled for November 16, 2015

C. Scope Changes

Title and Brief Description	Date Approved	Schedule Impact (weeks)	Budget Impact (\$ amount)

D. Issues and Risks

Title and Brief Description	Date Identified	Planned Resolution	Responsible for Resolution

E. Additional Comments

DPHHS internal project reporting rates the Scope as “Yellow”. At this time DPHHS does not believe that there are any significant scope issues affecting the project. There are currently 27 gaps where DPHHS and Xerox are not in agreement regarding scope. There are 331 past due action items that could result in gaps that are determined by Xerox to be out-of-scope. DPHHS will continue to rate scope as “yellow” until the number of past due action items drops below 50.

Legislative Finance Committee: IT Project Portfolio Supplemental Report

DPHHS internal project reporting rates the Schedule as “Red”. Xerox continues to experience challenges executing the approved project schedule, resulting in slipped tasks and past due deliverables. This has resulted in missed interim deliverables and deliverables. The latest Xerox calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI) is currently .528 (SPI that is less than .940 is “Red”). The current SPI is consistent with the lack of design progress reported by Xerox, the 4,297 slipped project tasks, and the 276 past due deliverables and interim deliverables. Xerox’s SPI and other key performance indicators indicate that Xerox will not successfully meet the May 30, 2017 full system implementation date.

DPHHS rates the Budget as “Green” based on the reporting criteria. Both the initial estimated cost and current estimated costs reflect the fully loaded costs of the project. Xerox has not been paid any money related to the payment milestones for the MMIS DDI project. The MMIS DDI contract established payment milestones requiring Xerox to deliver working software configured to Montana’s business requirements that can be demonstrated to our business users for their approval. The only expenditures to date are for DPHHS related expenses including DPHHS Business Analysts, DPHHS Subject Matter Experts, Contract Project Manager, Independent Verification and Validation contractor, rent, operational expenses, and indirect expenditures. All of these expenditures were planned and are customary for this type of project. These expenditures are required by CMS to support the execution of the project.

DPHHS internal project reporting rates Risk as “Yellow”. There are two project risks with a Risk Rank of 5 and 4. Both of these risks have a risk mitigation plan. Xerox will need an approved contingency plan for each of these risks. The remaining project risk has a risk rank of 8 and has the required risk mitigation plan. DPHHS has reviewed these risk mitigation plans and has provided feedback to Xerox to improve the approach to managing these risks.

**Legislative Finance Committee: IT Project Portfolio
Supplemental Report**

LFC Meeting Date: September 2015

A. General Project Information

1. Agency: DOA – MPERA
2. Project Title: MPERAtiv
3. Date Prepared: 9/1/2015
4. Prepared By: Riley, Angela

B. Project Status

1. Overall Health: Yellow
2. Brief description of current project status

Overall health of this project has improved from red to yellow. The project has undergone replanning and contract negotiations, both of which gained approval by the MPERA Board on 6/11/2015. The schedule is yellow, as the data conversion is behind schedule; however, it is within contingency and current trajectory indicates no delay to next major milestone (user acceptance testing).

All risks have mitigation plans and contingency in the schedule. Because these risks are in areas of the project that previously caused a replanning, the status remains as yellow.

A successful entrance into user acceptance testing on September 28 will move the overall project status to green.

3. Major milestones completed so far:
 - Project Initiation – 11/14/2012
 - Design
 - i. Iteration 1 – 6/17/2013
 - ii. Iteration 2 – 12/31/2013
 - iii. Iteration 3 – 8/27/2014
 - Development Complete (includes system testing)
 - i. Iteration 1 – 9/11/2013
 - ii. Iteration 2 – 2/13/2014
 - iii. Iteration 3 – 10/24/2014
 - User Acceptance Testing
 - i. Planned Dates: 1/27/2015 – 6/4/2015
 - ii. Halted on 3/5/2015 for replanning

Legislative Finance Committee: IT Project Portfolio Supplemental Report

LFC Meeting Date: September 2015

4. Next milestone(s):

- Phase 1 (approximate)
 - i. Change request and legislature design complete – 8/13/2015
 - ii. Change request and legislature development complete – 9/25/2015
 - iii. Data conversion readiness – 7/31/2015
 - iv. User acceptance testing – 9/28/2015-2/8/2015
 - v. Employer / agency Training 2/17/2016 – 4/13/2016
 - vi. Deployment - 5/3/2016
- Phase 2 (approximate)
 - i. Phase 2 (year end processing) design complete – 8/25/2015
 - ii. Phase 2 (year end processing) development complete – 12/21/2015
 - iii. User acceptance testing - 2/9/2016 – 3/22/2016
 - iv. Deployment - 5/3/2016

C. Scope Changes

Title and Brief Description	Date Approved	Schedule Impact (weeks)	Budget Impact (\$ amount)
31 change requests logged since the beginning of the project	Various	30	*
Legislature changes	6/11/2015	9	*

* These items were part of the replanning and negotiations of the project. The revised plan and budget were approved by the MPERA Board on 6/11/2015

D. Issues and Risks

Title and Brief Description	Date Identified	Planned Resolution	Responsible for Resolution
Risk – Additional Change Requests As we enter user acceptantct testing 9/28/2015, there is a risk that we will find additional items that need to be completed by go live that could impact our cost and potentially the schedule.	1/5/2015	Mitigation – conducted reviews of business processes in new system to identify changes early. Modest contingency built into schedule to accommodate changes.	Riley, Angela
Issue/Risk – Data Conversion Schedule Impact Data conversion is a current issue, as it did not meet original due date. Until it is complete, it will pose a risk to the project timeline	12/15/2014	Regular working sessions and additional oversight on the data conversion tasks. Contingency built into the schedule to minimize delay impacts.	Riley, Angela with oversight project manager

**Legislative Finance Committee: IT Project Portfolio
Supplemental Report**

LFC Meeting Date: September 2015

E. Additional Comments

Please consider including any diagrams, charts, pictures or other visuals that will help the committee better understand the project.

Legislative Finance Committee IT Project Portfolio: Post Implementation Report

LFC Meeting Date: September 24, 2015

1. Agency: Administration: Department of Administration
2. Project title: Montana Public Safety Communications System
3. Executive sponsor: Ron Baldwin, SCIO
4. Project close date: October 1, 2015
5. Appropriated budget amount: \$3 million (2013 HB10 Appropriation)
6. Total project development cost: \$69.4 million
7. Expected ongoing annual cost: \$7.250 million
8. Year the ongoing annual cost started: 2015
9. Funding source(s) for ongoing cost: Local Governments
10. List the primary project goals: Build a statewide P-25 VHF shared trunked public safety land mobile radio system
11. List the key project objectives, the metrics used to measure these objectives, and the final metric results.

	Key Objectives	Metric Used	Final Results
1	Infrastructure	141 Communication Sites	101 Completed
2	Microwave (MW)	140 MW Hops	90 Completed; 4 In Progress
3	Trunking	121 Trunked Sites	56 Completed

12. List and describe all post-implementation issues that have arisen and, if they have been resolved, what was the solution. If they have not been resolved, describe actions taken so far and possible solutions. Also list and describe any possible concerns.

	Start Date	Resolved Date	Issues and Concerns
1			
2			
3			

13. Please add any additional comments the agency would like to provide to the committee, if any.

The project has not secured funding to support the completion of the statewide system build-out and statewide radio coverage. State funding to support the ongoing system costs (operation and maintenance) has not been secured.

Legislative Finance Committee

IT Project Portfolio: Post Implementation Report

1. Agency: [DPHHS](#)
2. Project title: [Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System \(SACWIS\) Safety Assessments and Centralized Intake -- MSAMS](#)
3. Executive sponsor: [Sarah Corbally](#)
4. Project close date: [06/30/2015](#)
5. Appropriated budget amount: \$2,030,783
6. Total project development cost: \$1,891,692
7. Expected ongoing annual cost: \$80,000
8. Year the ongoing annual cost started: 2015
9. Funding source(s) for ongoing cost: split between GF and FF supported through agency indirects; funding split is at blended Title IV-E rate of approximately 64% general funds and 36% federal funds.
10. List the primary project goals:
 - a. Allow for a bi-directional interface with current CAPS application
 - b. Remove the need for CI Reports to be handwritten and later entered into CAPS
 - c. Allow for the rapid transmission of CPS Reports to Field Supervisors
 - d. Allow for online direct entry of Present Danger Assessment and the Family Functioning Assessment Reports
 - e. Allow for the online entry of Out-Of-Home and In-Home safety plans
 - f. Allow for the management of documents and process through workflow component controls (for completion, prioritization, authorization and escalation)
 - g. Remove dependencies on hardcopy documents – forms will be electronic and real-time
 - h. Provide a robust application that leverages up-to-date technologies
 - i. MSAMS will inherit security from CAPS for roles, organizational ownership, and geographic location.
11. List the key project objectives, the metrics used to measure these objectives, and the final metric results.

	Key Objectives	Metric Used	Final Results
1	Requirements Gathering / Planning	Gather and document requirements specific to the various forms, security, and functionality of the application	DPHHS Accepted
2	Development / Implementation	Complete the design and development of the screens and necessary function of the application. Test the system, then train and roll-out application to end users.	DPHHS Accepted

Legislative Finance Committee IT Project Portfolio: Post Implementation Report

12. List and describe all post-implementation issues that have arisen and, if they have been resolved, what was the solution. If they have not been resolved, describe actions taken so far and possible solutions. Also list and describe any possible concerns.

	Start Date	Resolved Date	Issues and Concerns
1	03/2014	04/2014	Stabilization issues (user access, network/environment, connectivity, etc...) Resolved by triaging between CFSD, PMB, SITSD, Northrop Grumman, and Montana Interactive.
1	06/01/2014	09/2014	Safety Committee Changes – developed, tested, and implemented changes as required
2	07/2014	07/2014	Supervisory Reviews Defect – Developed, tested, and implemented changes as required
3	07/2014	08/2014	New user role implemented -- Developed, tested, and implemented changes as required
4	07/2014	08/2014	Placement forms and report closure defect -- Developed, tested, and implemented changes as required
5	08/2014	09/2014	Printing forms with Signatures -- Developed, tested, and implemented changes as required
6	01/2015	06/2015	Data Extract -- Developed, tested, and working on finalizing data output

13. Please add any additional comments the agency would like to provide to the committee, if any.