

Roles, Rules of Engagement and Future Shared Service Participation in the City of Pittsburgh Payroll Implementation.

July 19, 2013

Author: Anthony Cholewinski, Manager Shared Services

This report is being issued to attempt to seek a definition of the roles of the Shared Service Center in the ongoing Payroll implementation. The trigger for this review is the recent unilateral decision to stretch the go-live date for the project into September after numerous shared go-live dates have been selected in a reasonable consensus building manner, an unclear understanding of the roles in the training of time keepers for the City which has led to mediocre training, unclear results and miscommunication to an already leery time keeping community. City roles in the project have never been clearly filled, or have been filled with names of people who clearly have never been instructed as to what those roles purposes are. In an attempt to keep this project moving, Shared services personnel have attempted to fulfill many of these roles with no rules of engagement, no authority to make decisions which has led to a mindless closed end loop of design, configure, test, propose, semi-acceptance, rethought and back to design. Another closed end loop has occurred where City stakeholders refuse training until a final solution is ready, however make internal decisions on process which has led to a mind numbing time keeping process that will not have a true integration test prior to go-live, and ties the hands of Denovo and County SME's by not allowing for training in time saving techniques.

Existing Roles for the City, Denovo and the Shared Service Center.

There is no existing agreement with the City and Shared Service Organization in relation to the City Payroll Implementation and has led to misinterpretation, ability for both organizations to deny responsibility or assign responsibility with nothing to base those assumptions. In the beginning, benefit and deduction structure was assumed by the service center through Sean Craig and this task is complete with subsequent re-design due to recent discovery handled by Steve Bradnam and now Traci Cutri. This task is 98 % complete pending any further discovery. Pay types setup was completed by Sean Craig and Chris Carragher much earlier in the project and has had minor adjustments due to recent discovery. These items have been complete for some time now. Cindy Fleming has been attached to the project from the beginning and has successfully led with equal participation from Denovo to the implementation of 3 pension fund payrolls with minimal participation of City resources. She has also attempted to fulfill ignored City responsibility for project management and training while designing checks and various other tasks as assigned. One of the required obligated roles of the service center is b

to coordinate technical connectivity between the City and JDE and this role has been stretched to include connectivity to the City desktop.

A few months ago, the project was in a state of decay with no plan to completion. The service center assisted in the replacement of the Denovo project manager. Tanda Nelson has collaboratively designed a plan to completion that had a timeline and responsibility matrix. The responsibilities of the service center have been mostly volunteered or filled where gaps have existed. The City project manager with this lack of written obligations has not clearly communicated to other City stakeholders what the shared service center responsibilities are. This has led to stakeholders making assumptions of who is doing what and creative and opportunistic project management of responsibility external to the Denovo responsibility matrix.

Recommendation: The City, Service Center, City Stakeholders and Denovo hold a meeting with clear definition of responsibilities in an honest manner with decision makers being present who will commit to the designation of their resources after Denovo clearly defines what those roles are and what level of commitment is required.

City and Denovo agreement

The City-Denovo agreement stems from a proposal dated June 22, 2012 and clearly defines roles, expectations and deliverables. The methodology is clearly defined in this proposal and has generally been ignored by the City from the beginning. This has been met with the initial Denovo PM to assign the challenges to risk and not pointing out the difference to the City. The second PM has tried many different approaches to mitigate risk and has been open and honest with expectations and adjusted when challenges have occurred.

The proposal from Denovo has a clear Organization structure for the success of the project which is based on successful project implementations and standard project management principles which have generally been described as “well intentioned” but not fitting the City of Pittsburgh culture by the current city PM. There have been no communicated changes to roles. The proposal clearly states “Extensive involvement of key City stakeholders is essential to ensure that the delivered solution meets stated requirements and the knowledge transfer between Denovo and stakeholders is maximized. Denovo is proposing to undertake the overall responsibility for completing the project. However, there are some areas and tasks where we rely on City stakeholders.” They are broken down as follows with the city involvement addressed in the agreement:

1. Manage the project Denovo responsible, City assist. Project Management is to determine scope, prepare the plan, budget, effective communications plan and **daily** monitoring of project activity. The areas where the City project manager has been lacking is preparing an effective communication plan that has good project meetings, issue tracking, change control policy and status reporting. He has done little in the area of preparing reports (and reporting accurately), building team work (actually

segmenting audiences and stakeholders), managing the timeline or maintaining project records and documentation.

2. Hardware installation, environment creation, technical operation support, technical go live support, interfaces, conversions – City responsible completed by County and Denovo.

3. Execute prototype – City responsible completed by Denovo and County.

4. Assist in Design, Build, test, and configuration – City assist, Denovo responsible, status = not completed.

5. Execute integration testing – In process, however city is balking at demands of participation.

6. Attend train the trainer – City responsible and is responsible for training. City has claimed that they have completed training, however when challenged with time keepers only having a demonstration, I was told that this is training in the City. The City is responsible for the training of City stakeholders, however this has not been clearly communicated by the City PM leading to the failure of training and that failure being laid upon Denovo and Shared Services. Subsequently, City management has stated an aversion to the train the trainer concept despite general acceptance in project implementations.

The level of the City participation expectation is defined from the matrix in the Denovo Proposal depicted below:

stakeholders is outline below.

Type of Resource	Skills	Role/Activities	% of Time
Steering Committee (assumes 3)	Sr. Level management – the decision makers	Review project progress, resolve escalated issues	<10%
Project Sponsor	Proven director level – able to oversee large projects	Monitor project progress, resolve escalated issues or escalate to the Steering Committee	4%
Project Manager	Proven IT project manager	Co-manage all aspects of the project with Denovo’s PM, resolve escalated issues or escalate to the Project Sponsor(s)	90%
OCM Coordinator	Good communications and execution skills	Define and execute the Organization Change Management plan	10%
IT Manager	Current IT management	Oversight of technology decisions & results	4%
IT Technology SME	Experience with IT system technical support	Learns system support capabilities, provides project CNC support (under Denovo CNC Lead’s direction)	50%
Payroll SME	Knowledgeable about payroll processes and City’s payroll requirements	Team lead for design, testing and training of E1 Payroll processes. Becomes in-house Payroll primary trainer & expert	25%
Payroll Manager	Current Payroll manager	Oversight of Payroll decisions & results	5%

Although required in the above matrix from the never signed proposal, there is no city steering committee, there is no project sponsor, the project manager is engaged about 25% and not 90% and has attempted to fill the roles of sponsor and steering committee, there is no OCM manager where culture change is the largest challenge to the project, there is no payroll manager as defined and Payroll SME’s have been engaged however inefficiently because of the lack of other roles and unclear definition from anyone in City management.

Recommendation: The City stop all illusion of attempting to act in the roles above, engage with Denovo for project completion of three months of post go live support and year end support where the Service Center will sit side by side to knowledge transfer and assume support in March of 2014. Denovo has represented that this is not an acceptable solution and require responsible, sustained and committed City participation.

Representations of the Project to External Audiences:

While the Service Center is happy to work with the City in its relationship with the Intergovernmental Cooperation Authority, we cannot represent the current configuration as an acceptable time capture system and will remain silent in all discussions with all parties and allow the City to communicate its understanding of the system. We will continue to support you in discussions with the ICA board.