# Project Closeout Report

**Project Name:** UND AiM Software Implementation

**Institution:** UND

**Business Unit/Program Area:** Facilities Management

**Project Sponsor:** Karla Stewart

**Project Manager:** Public Knowledge PMO Support

| Objectives | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Measurements** | |
| **Project Objectives** | **Met/ Not Met** | **Description** |
| Engage The Community to Improve Customer Experience | Met | The deployment of ReADY Request, a user-friendly, integrated facility self-service request solution that improves communication across the campus and speeds up request to resolution. Reduce the number of service tickets logged directly by Service Analysts by 10% within 6 months of go-live. |
| Automation of Manual Business Processes | Partially | The delivery of the new system with custom integrations with PeopleSoft and Ad Astra. Twenty-five purchases will flow through Central Purchasing to PeopleSoft within 60 days of go-live. The automation of the upload of space record changes to Ad Astra within 60 days of production deployment of the new system. |
| Improved Management of Capital Projects | Met | The Capital Projects module is delivered, and the system is being used to manage projects. Five projects will be managed in the system within 1 year of go-live. |

| Schedule Objectives | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Met/ Not Met** | **Original Baseline Schedule (in Months)** | **Final Baseline Schedule (in Months)** | **Actual Schedule (in Months)** | **Variance to Original Baseline** | **Variance to Final Baseline** |
| Not Met | 26 | 37 | 40 | 14 Months (54%) Behind Original Baseline Schedule | 3 Months (8%) Behind Final Baseline Schedule |

| Budget Objectives | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Met/ Not Met** | **Original Baseline Budget** | **Final Baseline Budget** | **Actual Costs** | **Variance to Original Baseline** | **Variance to Final Baseline** |
| Met | $2,158,272 | 3,060,032 | 2,825,476 | $667,204 (31%) Over Original Baseline Budget | $234,556 (8%) Under the Final Baseline Budget |

| Major Scope Changes |
|---|
| There were no scope changes that occurred during the project. There were three project objectives to this project. One of those was "Improved Management of Capital Projects." The Capital Project (CPPM) module was in the third phase of the project. As the planning was taking place, it was discovered there was a miscommunication between AssetWorks and UND regarding what was accepted in the original contract. AssetWorks had bid that module as a "Proof of Concept" (POC) implementation and through discussions it was determined that UND wanted a higher service level than that. It was decided that other modules in phase three would be changed to a proof-of-concept type of implementation and |

also, there was an increased dollar change order that was executed to change the CPPM implementation to a "Best Practices" implementation rather than the original POC.

Also, as the project progressed, there were more interfaces between Jaggaer and AiM than originally anticipated. They also proved to be more complex, and therefore required additional time to develop, build and test.

| Lessons Learned |
| --- |

1. Making sure integration with other IT groups is logged and part of the plan, there was not enough time built into the schedule to account for the integration testing for phase 1 & 2. Planned additional time for Phase 3 based on this lesson learned.
2. PM more involved in handling small details, action items communications etc. Suggest an onsite visit at least monthly to have in person meetings and check-ins.
3. Writing test cases and having a more thorough review earlier in the planning. UND may consider implementing a requirements traceability matrix to ensure all requirements are completed and tested.
4. Understanding all needs across the university to plan what tools will be used and by whom. Recommend implementing a user group of stakeholders. Not only for future planning but to open communications on possible system issues and resolutions. Identifying training needs and testing groups for future changes and/or upgrades.
5. More collaboration/exposure between teams. Sometimes the teams were only trained on their section so didn't see the bigger picture. Maybe different decisions would have been made if there was more interaction between groups.

| Success Stories |
| --- |

1. When reflecting on the project with the two main vendors – AssetWorks & NProdigy, they were both amazed with the number of interfaces that were built out during this project. There ended up being 20+. With their experience they said that is rare because it is extremely difficult to get departments to work together and develop good processes for the good of all involved. The AiM system is highly connected with PeopleSoft and Jaggaer. AssetWorks is highlighting UND as a great success story at their AssetWorld 2024 Conference, an annual gathering of facilities professionals that use AssetWorks' solutions (ReADY, AiM & Go) to better manage their facilities operations. This is a great honor and will showcase UND's successes and story specifically around the integrations.
2. The CPPM budgets should help all project managers, finance staff and other interested parties to know where a project is at all times.
3. All POs in AiM are now reflected in Jaggaer and PeopleSoft Finance.
4. There are numerous dashboards that have been built out for different audiences. It's a quick way for the staff to see if they have timecards to approve, invoices to review, the work orders they need to work on, etc. This is an area that will grow in the future even more.
5. ReADY tiles have only scratched the surface of their use. Departments that request a lot of routine services were trained on how to submit requests on their own so that the Operations Center didn't have to enter/translate so much information. Some of these departments included Dining Services, Housing, Memorial Union and the Wellness Center.