



memo

To: Erin Deveney, Registrar
From: Jennifer Tuvell
CC: Maggie Gleason
Date: 2/22/2019
Re: Deviation from Methodology - Enforcement

Adhering to the FAST methodology is critical for our implementation projects to be fully successful. The deviations from the methodology in the area of Enforcement continue to be a concern. While the risks from these deviations have been raised to the ESC and that risk accepted we do want to ensure that, as Registrar, you are aware of the issues and their impacts.

The Enforcement area has persistently deviated from the FAST Methodology. Examples of this are:

Methodology best practice	Deviation
Assigning knowledgeable and trusted business representatives as team leads	A contractor was assigned in lieu of an Enforcement business representative
Expert users are assigned from the business	A contractor was assigned in lieu of an Enforcement business representative
Adhere to FAST Training Approach	The DCU group did not take part in planned Release 1 training, instead constructing their own program
Test in managed testing lab	For enforcement, testing in Business Testing and End to End Testing occurred outside of the Testing Room in QHQ

While we understand that RMV has operational issue with resources, the purpose of using the FAST methodology is not only to ensure an on time and on budget implementation, but to provide a set of power users and experts within the agency who can represent their business practices and decisions and take back their expertise to their divisions. This will not occur with Enforcement, specifically within DCU because while some RMV business people were involved in some parts of definition,



testing or training, none of them were involved for all of it 100%. Any activities outside the FAST Methodology, whether deviations or additions to, pose significant risks to the implementation.

This consistent deviation is causing and will continue to cause the following impacts:

- Tasks will continue to be late or laggard. Decisions that come up late in the definition or testing process will have a cascading effect to the rest of the project including training and conversion. This means that training may not be accurate and conversion may not have the correct information. The only way to remedy this is to have actual business SMEs perform the verification and training delivery.
- Configured Enforcement functionality, while somewhat late, will be finished by go-live, but the quality and accuracy suffer since Business SMEs did not have ownership in managing the Enforcement Team. This is likely to result in less acceptance by the business post go-live.
- Late definitions and adjustments to the enforcement configuration causes more changes to occur post-rollout. This causes other pull list items OR new requests post-rollout to be delayed.
- Degraded quality on this team could affect outcomes after rollout. There may a higher incident of issues that require executive support for prioritization.

As planning begins for Rollout 2 there is an opportunity to ensure that the FAST Methodology is more closely followed and more positive results achieved as a result. Operational stress is common during these projects. However, the temporary stress and difficulty of providing business experts to the projects greatly outweighs the long-term stress and problems that result from a deficiency of business expert resources assigned to the project.