

Roadmap Feasibility Study
Next Steps Considerations Transition Document
February 16, 2007

During the *Roadmap* Feasibility Study feedback process a number of suggestions were made by reviewers that didn't fit within the structure of the document. However, these suggestions should be considered as the project moves forward. This document captures those ideas (by project phase where possible) and were conveyed to the *Roadmap* Project Team.

General Suggestions:

ID #	Suggestion
1.	The development of an enterprise chart of accounts is a significant endeavor. The Chart of Accounts exists in different systems (HRMS, TRAINS, AFRS, etc...), so it will be important to coordinate what changes are made, what the order of implementation is, and how they are synched during the transition.
2.	Recommend that an assessment of state agencies' resource needs to implement the core financial application, supported by an enterprise budget approach, be included as a Roadmap project deliverable during 2007-09. One of the lessons learned from HRMS was that agencies did not have adequate staff resources to accomplish key HRMS requirements.
3.	<p>Recommend a funding strategy that provides agencies with incentives to use the new system to its fullest potential. The 'haves' and 'have-nots' syndrome mentioned on page 29 will continue without this strategy. With the implementation of AFRS, agencies experienced 'sticker shock' for which they were not prepared. This resulted in agencies eliminating essential reports and surviving on bare essentials; sending as few entries as possible to AFRS, thereby not utilizing all the coding functionality; not using DRS because of additional costs; and other cost-cutting measures. Agencies who had the funds to pay could afford the new features; those that didn't had to cut back.</p> <p>On page 71, OFM's costs to fund a project integrator and fund the application are estimated. We have learned from HRMS how difficult it is to accurately estimate costs for projects of this magnitude. Should increased costs occur, what is the plan to fund these additional costs? With AFRS, agencies had to absorb many of them. Is there a safety net for agencies?</p>
4.	Adding non-financial data to the project adds complexity moves it away from the financial focus and will be subjective in regard to how and whose performance measures it was built for. If this is determined to be a critical and necessary function, it will be essential for budget, GMAP and financial experts in OFM and agencies to come to agreement on those items.
5.	<p>Activity Based Costing and Reporting</p> <p>The Office of Financial Management should collaborate with agencies to propose appropriate activity definitions and measures for program and department-wide functions, and determining appropriate levels of detail for statewide vs. agency views.</p>

ID #	Suggestion
6.	What is the current thinking on the cost/funding model for the new system and this multi-year effort? Agencies need to understand how the rates will be derived and be able to build them into future budgets.
7.	The challenge of agency capacity for a project of this magnitude is a huge issue. It is critical to have key agency stakeholder involvement early and often throughout the process. It is one of the key lessons learned in HRMS. Many agencies are still struggling in terms of workload and stress with the implementation of HRMS and it is not clear how soon they will be available to contribute in a meaningful fashion to this project. I feel that the Roadmap process has already been compromised to a degree by prioritizing a tight time schedule over agency participation. I appreciate the reality behind the Roadmap's timeline, but I saw and continue to see the impact of the HRMS implementation on agency's capacity to participate in the Roadmap project in a meaningful way. HRMS aside, the state is very lean on administrative capacity. While the time allowed to provide feedback to this document is reasonable, this is a very, very busy time of year. I'm already working 10 – 11 hours a day & weekends and feel badly that I can't give this review the attention that it warrants.
8.	Dollars in the budget won't necessarily buy the qualified staff agencies will need to free up key people to participate, but staff to backfill will help. The amount included in the decision packet for 07-09 for agency backfill does not seem adequate for the scope of the work planned. I know that this is less than what was requested – but that is our reality. How will our reality impact the project? And, I can't get a sense of how well the staffing impact was addressed beyond 07-09.
9.	From the vantage point of my limited participation in the Roadmap project to date I did not get the impression that some of the key users of state data were involved – namely, the legislative staff and committees. The next phase of the project really needs to involve these key data users.
10.	Any change to the Chart of Accounts will have an impact on interfacing systems. While the vision is that some of these systems will be eliminated with the implementation of SAP, many line of business systems will be retained – this could be especially problematic for higher ed. Has the schedule/cost analysis considered the time and resources required to modify interfaces? From our previous chart of accounts study I got the impression that this was no small matter.
11.	<p>Lessons Learned from HRMS.</p> <p>Recommend adding more specifics in this section, and how these lessons learned will be applied to the Roadmap project. For example, reconciliation testing was one area that fell short during HRMS implementation. Also, recommend adding more specifics to define HRMS stabilization.</p>
12.	<p>Lessons learned from HRMS – here's a few more</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project management has to have good project management skills. • Project management must develop and maintain a good working relationship with agency personnel – business and technical. • Contractors should not manage the project. • IT should not drive the process. • Contractors should be familiar with the application they are implementing. • It would be helpful if project management was also familiar with the state environment.

ID #	Suggestion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project communication needs to be addressed to the appropriate people. • The project schedule should not drive go-live date. A reasonable well tested application combined with a reasonable level of agency readiness should play at least some role. • There should be a focus on things like security, training, and reporting at the beginning of the project, throughout the implementation, and post implementation as well. • Project resources are needed post-implementation. Without post implementation support, even the best implementation effort can not be successful. • The project must be adequately, appropriately funded at the start. We ran into trouble with the federal government by using current resources to finance a capital project. • QA should play a meaningful role. If we go SAP, we should consider using SAP for this role. <p>Project management decision making should not vest in one person.</p>
13.	Lessons Learned from HRMS. We were happy to see recognition of these items. One additional item, as mentioned in the last advisory committee meeting, is to adequately resource the post implementation activities for at a year to more easily (and quickly!) address problem areas.
14.	Funding should include change management and follow-on maintenance and support (training, help-desk, web-tools, etc.) for users after implementation should also be included.
15.	In order to be successful, this change management should include agency personnel that are performing the tasks, not only agency management staff. Also, the more agencies involved the better the outcome.
16.	The capacity of agencies needs to be taken into consideration in the timing and cost of a new ERP system. Costs need to include all agency system modifications (including higher ed) and time and dollar resources needed to comply with any changes to statewide data requirements.
17.	I am not sure the issue of non-financial data was ever addressed (I do not recall discussing the transfer of client data from our eligibility systems to this new system).

Phase I – Positioning Activities

ID #	Suggestion
1.	Loss of System Functionality. Strategies must be developed to ensure that there is no loss of system functionality.
2.	There are several opportunities that could arise from the Chart of Accounts and common data definition efforts. While consistency and comparability are good, some business activities are not common across agencies, so active problem solving about how to meet business needs while meeting the common good will need the time and attention of a variety of interests. Further, consideration needs to be given to historical data and if or how it converts.
3.	Expanding HRMS also provides some opportunities for evaluating agency systems, not just time and attendance reporting, but should also consider how labor costing activities are carried out. Changes in this arena may require approval of federal funding agencies.
4.	Positioning Activities - Stabilization of HRMS - I don't believe that you can underestimate the importance of this activity. What you might consider adding is that agencies need to develop a common understanding of what stabilizing HRMS means. Unless we do that I believe that it will be nearly impossible to achieve because we will all view it differently. This will require that DOP engage agency management and users in meaningful discussions about the system.
5.	Page 84 - Addressing resistance to change. I believe that while there will always be a level of resistance to change, user acceptance will be largely dependent upon significant improvement in the HRMS project. Now payroll staff are working long hours and under considerable stress. Retention of payroll staff is a significant issue. Other financial staff observe this and it will be difficult to convince them that this is a good direction unless we can make genuine improvements.
6.	Once stabilized, will agencies still need to redirect and/or add resources to support HRMS activities? Etc.
7.	Another area of concern regarding anything with the "enterprise" label is the costs to agencies in terms of unfunded mandates creating the need for agencies to absorb costs and/or redirect direct service resources. "Good of the order" initiatives that we all must engage in because we're part of the enterprise always come with a price, commonly borne by the agencies.
8.	Requirements Identification – The requirements, we were told repeatedly, gathered in the modeling sessions were just at a “high level”. None of the comments, or suggestions, or gripes were checked for accuracy, reasonableness, or reality. Many key agency personnel could not attend due to critical timing of the HRMS implementation. And the process did not include legislative staff, budget staff, or higher education institutions. The “requirements” may change significantly when all the players weigh in.

Phase II – Design and Configuration

ID #	Suggestion
1.	SAP technical architecture concerns: Multiple passwords required for SAP indicate that there may be a fundamental architectural problem with the software. This has created a large burden for our Help Desk in managing multiple passwords. Other indicators of this are the decision that we cannot implement Explorer 7. Recent state firewall reconfigurations to accommodate issues with HRMS has meant that our implementation of Microsoft Reporting Services have required workarounds.
2.	It may also be important to include in the positioning activities an analysis of pricing/cost recovery approaches for the new system. Some of our current pricing mechanisms may provide unintended incentives for agencies to subvert the effort to supply data needed from enterprise perspective in order to save costs at the agency level.
3.	It has been our experience that a phase-in approach works well if phasing-in is discontinued when serious system problems occur. A back-up plan should be required if the ERP is not performing as planned and the ability to revert “back to the old” until such time that essential functionality is available. (Pages 64-65)
4.	<p>Problem Statements</p> <p>Reporting, interfacing and performance measures are high on the list of problems currently faced. These should be the goal and focus of the new financial system. Where does non-financial data fit into SAP functionality? Adding non-financial data to the project adds complexity moves it away from the financial focus and will be subjective in regard to how and whose performance measures it was built for. If this is determined to be a critical and necessary function, it will be essential for budget, GMAP and financial experts in OFM and agencies to come to agreement on those items.</p>

Phase III – Convert and Implement

ID #	Suggestion
1.	Disaster Recovery Implications: The complexity of the environment (pieces of the system residing on 50 servers in Figure 10, Page 51) necessitates a discussion of disaster recovery requirements in the event that any part of the configuration fails.
2.	Start with Security and Reports to ensure success.