

# FTL / Kronos Implementation Lessons Learned Review

Tim Currie

# Agenda

- Project Review
- Solution / Vendor Review
- Go-Live / Post Go-Live Review
- Additional Lessons Learned

# Project Review

- Project execution in a fixed delivery timeline
- Stakeholder Interaction and contributions
- Requirements and Business processes Lessons

Faced with a daunting tasks of a highly customized internally developed solution, on top of what was already a highly customized vendor solution, the project team embarked on an aggressive buy versus build approach to project delivery. This solution relied heavily on the delivery capabilities of the vendor (Kronos), a mixed delivery team, and an agile development approach. The team delivered the solution in time to meet the goal – but not without challenges and impact to many stakeholders.

# Project Review

## Project execution in a fixed delivery timeline

Lesson	Impact	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fixed timeline forced project team to de-scope functionality</li><li>• Fixed timeline required additional resources to support project team</li><li>• Fixed timeline required additional vendor delivery resources to meet timeline</li><li>• Project success relied too heavily on vendor delivery which left project team powerless at critical delivery points</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Delivery of essential functionality (historical edit, mass historical edit, some reporting) was delayed until post go-live, which placed an undue burden on finance/account resources.</li><li>• CD resources were pulled from other projects and priorities to support the project.</li><li>• Additional budget was required to fund additional vendor resources</li><li>• Both the CD and the vendor resources became “burned out”.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• ID challenging features early and insure delivery.</li><li>• Mitigate reliance on vendor by executing fixed bid or milestone based contracts.</li><li>• Establish better escalation methods with vendor to mitigate delivery issues</li><li>• Trust gut instincts with respect to acceptance of vendor resources.</li><li>• ...</li></ul>

# Project Review

## Stakeholder Interaction and contributions

Lesson	Impact	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Core team dynamics were a dysfunctional, with some members dominating sessions, and alienating other members</li><li>• Front line management was not well represented</li><li>• Some core team members took a cynical approach to the team meetings, and limited the ability to get things done constructively.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Inordinate amount of time spent on “red herring” issues like non-computer literate users, etc.</li><li>• vendor recommendations on best practices (effort reporting between the punches, use of schedules, use of punch machines, etc.) were not headed, because it was considered too complex for the employees, resulting in an overly complex and error prone effort reporting procedures.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cycle resources through the core teams for projects that span years.</li><li>• Engage more front-line management in requirements and design</li><li>• Build time in for focus groups to insure that all usage needs are addressed.</li><li>• .....</li></ul>

# Project Review

## Requirements and Business processes

Lesson	Impact	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lab-wide effort reporting processes were inconsistent, and not aligned prior to implementation.</li><li>• Employee on-boarding, summer student and on-call business processes were inconsistent.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• in order to accommodate all uses of project / tasks as well as their naming conventions, the team relied too heavily on the problematic % allocation function within in the tool – which proved to be defective</li><li>• reliance on the % allocation tool limits the real time reporting capabilities of the tool, requiring additional custom interface/export for reporting in discoverer, as well as manual processes to support requests of users.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Focus on the alignment of business processes before implementing tools.</li><li>• Reform business processes and gain support / agreement of stakeholders before implementing tools.</li><li>• ....</li></ul>

# Solution / Vendor Review

- Vendor solutions, understanding strengths and weaknesses
- Performance goals negotiation – leaving room for lessons learned
- Vendor business relationship

The vendor selected (Kronos) provided a solution which consisted of their market leading software for time reporting, professional services to aid the FTL team in delivery, and an outsourced hosted environment and application support service.

# Solution / Vendor Review

## Vendor solutions, understanding strengths and weaknesses

Lesson	Impact	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Vendor solution had several mismatched with required functionality</li><li>• Critical functionality ended up built around immature / defective % allocation feature</li><li>• % allocation defect rendered the solution inoperable after go-live.</li><li>• Lots of time spent on pay rules, but effort reporting proved to be the biggest challenge</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• De-scoped features were not able to be delivered as promised</li><li>• Required intensive project &amp; vendor resource commitment during what should've been scale-down period.</li><li>• Effort reporting for non-exempts proved to be complicated and error prone for employees and front line management</li><li>• A heavy resource burden was placed on time-keepers and financial stakeholders</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Insure that the critical functionality is mature and can be demonstrated by a broad range of reference sites.</li><li>• insure that the right functionality is utilized from the vendor solution (e.g. the activities module) even if it impacts the cost model.</li><li>• ....</li></ul>

# Solution / Vendor Review

## Vendor solutions, understanding strengths and weaknesses

Lesson	Impact	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Vendor solution had several mismatches with required functionality (continued)</li><li>• Vendor delivery model was a miss-match with internally hosted ERP solution set.</li><li>• Project delivery method (Agile) was a miss-match with internally hosted ERP solution set.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Browser interface did not work for all of labs standards, requiring use of java client – which has very poor performance.</li><li>• The interfaces between the lab’s ERP systems and Kronos were too numerous and complex, requiring more development by both CD and vendor resources and impacting project schedule.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• insure that any lab-wide solution is a true “web app” that does not have any browser limitations.</li><li>• work to simplify the ERP infrastructure, or make sure that the chosen solution can be easily interfaced to the existing infrastructure.</li><li>• ...</li></ul>

# Solution / Vendor Review

## Performance goals negotiation – leaving room for lessons learned

Lesson	Impact	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The PEMP goal required a combined functionality of time entry and effort reporting – which was unique among most vendor reference sites and HEP labs.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This requirement put a tremendous burden on the project, the vendor, and the stakeholders.</li><li>• The combination of these competing requirements as implemented in the Kronos solution</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Allow the project team to de-scope if required through amendment of the PEMP goal.</li><li>• Respond to PEMP goals with the minimum required commitment to provide the project delivery team room to maneuver.</li><li>• ...</li></ul>

# Solution / Vendor Review

## Vendor business relationship

Lesson	Impact	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Vendor had a lack of depth in critical functional areas</li><li>• Vendor business units (engineering, delivery, hosting) are poorly integrated and difficult to manage issues through phases.</li><li>• The hosting operation is immature, and does not exhibit best practices (like ITIL/ISO 20K controls)</li><li>• T&amp;M structure of contract too risky for team</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The solution is dependent upon a single Kronos resource – greatly limiting how quickly problems can be solved or new features provided.</li><li>• Project team was put in a “feed the beast” mode to keep the delivery resources on pace impacting budget.</li><li>• Management of the hosting environment requires an in-ordinate resource load by Information Systems team.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Choose a vendor with demonstrated depth and strength in the critical required functions.</li><li>• Choose functions that are in the sweet spot of the vendor, or in line with their best practices.</li><li>• When possible choose Software as a Service (SAAS) offerings instead of “hosted” solutions. SAAS requires a higher level of competency and best practices on the behalf of the vendor and should prove more stable.</li><li>• “Beware the Magic Quadrant”</li><li>• ....</li></ul>

# Go-Live / Post Go-Live Review

- Go-Live Deliberations and Lessons learned

As the June 2010 go-live date approached, functionality was de-scoped with the intention of delivery after go-live (when it was required for the underlying business processes). The team made a decision to go-live with the understanding that there was some risk on holding off on delivery. Post go-live, the vendor solution experienced a critical defect which took months to resolve, impacting many business stakeholders as well as the team's ability to deliver the promised de-scoped functionality.

# Go-Live / Post Go-Live Review

## Go-Live Deliberations and Lessons learned

Lesson	Impact	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Financial stakeholders were not comfortable with the go-live decision, because some of their essential requirements were postponed.</li><li>• The reporting requirements were not well documented or addressed by go-live.</li><li>• The quality controls and error detection processes were not well documented at go-live.</li><li>• Activity maintenance was not fully mature at go-live</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Essential reporting was not delivered as promised because the project team had to focus on the defective % allocation function.</li><li>• Time keepers and payroll resources were swamped after go-live helping end users and intercepting faulty timecards.</li><li>• Reporting and activity maintenance was not fully delivered until in months after go-live (or not at all), further impacting the time keepers and payroll resources</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Focus on the alignment of business processes before implementing tools.</li><li>• Reform business processes and gain support / agreement of stakeholders before implementing tools.</li><li>• Deal with reporting requirements early in the project and build out the functionality in parallel with the supporting business process.</li><li>• Understand the true risks to the organization and impact on stakeholders</li><li>• ...</li></ul>

# Go-Live / Post Go-Live Review

## Go-Live Deliberations and Lessons learned

Lesson	Impact	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Because of the issues with complexity and timecard errors, new manual processes had to be developed on the fly .</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• FFM's , timekeepers and Finance stakeholders were severely impacting from a resource perspective.</li><li>• The learning curve and comfort level of stakeholders was stressed – creating the feeling that the system was “dumped on them” or that they had to “pick up the pieces”. This is in contrast to past delivery experiences which made allowances to business stakeholders to adopt processes around new functionality before going live.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Focus on the alignment of business processes before implementing tools.</li><li>• Even under an accelerated timeline – integrate stakeholders into the design process earlier.</li><li>• If possible delay delivery of the system or have a more realistic gauge of the impact / risk and plan accordingly.</li><li>•...</li></ul>

# Additional Lessons Learned

## From the 2/14 Meeting Minutes

Lesson	Impact	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Core team, as well as some MAT team members, did not always feel as if their concerns were listened to.</li><li>• In particular, the complexity of reporting effort with hours, and especially the impact on people who don't use computers.</li><li>• Since many members of the core team objected fundamentally to the combination reporting of effort and hours in the same system...many felt cynical and disenfranchised about the team dynamics</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• AD in particular has 2 full time people (timekeepers) reviewing 500 timecards between Friday and Monday, which is a tremendous strain on resources.</li><li>• Although the pay rules reflect policy – the changes in the way certain shifts were calculated led to rumors among shift workers that their pay was impacted.</li><li>• Historical edits still impact the current timecard calculations – making resolution extremely complicated.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Even under an accelerated timeline – integrate stakeholders into the design process earlier.</li><li>• Make sure that stakeholders feel their contributions and concerns are being considered, and take the time (through focus groups, etc.) to make them comfortable with input to decisions.</li><li>• There has to be a win for the core team stakeholders in the success fo the project</li></ul>

# Additional Lessons Learned

## From the 2/14 Meeting Minutes

Lesson	Impact	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Vendor may have misled the project team with regards to complexity, interface work, or the effort required.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The vendor could not respond correctly when we had issues with delivery, or with post go-live support.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Perhaps a more mid-tier or research lab aligned vendor is more appropriate to our needs</li><li>• Due diligence in the specific areas that make our environment and/or our requirements unique should be the focus of future vendor/solution reviews.</li></ul>

# Additional Lessons Learned

Additional comments from the 2/14/11 Lessons Learned meeting can be found in Doc DB