# Iterative Project Report for Programs & Multi-Year Phased Projects

Submitted to Project Oversight on 7/18/2021

## GENERAL INFORMATION

**Program/Project Name:** Enterprise Service Management (ESM)

**Agency Name:** North Dakota Information Technology (NDIT)

**Project Sponsor:** Duane Schell

**Project Manager:** Jacob Chaput

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In November 2016, North Dakota Information Technology (NDIT) conducted an IT operational assessment. Using the Gartner maturity model, the maturity was identified as 1.1 out of 5.0. As a result, the NDIT Service Management initiative and vision was created to leverage the best practices of Information Technology Information Library (ITIL) versions 3 and 4 and a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) Enterprise Service Management (ESM) tool. ServiceNow, a leading-edge technology in service delivery, was selected to enhance the enterprise operations of NDIT and other participating State entities. Furthermore, these technologies will replace current systems such as the HEAT ticketing system, and most of the State's Work Management System (WMS).

To ensure maximum adoption and efficient communication, the ESM Program will be comprised of multiple projects and will address the baseline needs and recommendations put forth by the stakeholder community both internally and externally.

The program solution for ESM contributes to several NDIT strategic objectives:

1. Provide a service management program with a maturity level of 3.1
2. Provide an enterprise architecture program that anticipates and enables business objectives
3. Provide cloud technology services that will empower people

## BUSINESS NEEDS AND PROBLEMS

1. To transform the User experience with Service Management, moving from reactive, monitoring/ tracking work to being proactive and helping to drive efficient business practices
2. To focus on the end-user experience, with engagement web spaces for requests, and maximize self-service with a dashboard view of the request lifecycles
3. To utilize real-time analytics to provide information for proactive, cost takeouts and more focused preventive actions resulting in higher and more cost-effective service level achievement, thus increasing Operational Efficiencies
4. To provide higher rates of First Level Resolutions (FLR) and self-service opportunities using a centralized Knowledge Management database

## PROGRAM/PROJECT FORMAT

**Program/Project Start Date:** 02/04/2020

**Budget Allocation at Time of Initial Start Date:** $2,200,000

**How Many Phases Expected at Time of Initial Start Date:** Four

**Phase Approach Description:** Program will include projects that are six months in length to allow checkpoints to analyze program needs and adjust accordingly.

**Estimated End Date for All Phases Known at Time of Initial Start Date:** 6/30/2021

## PROGRAM/PROJECT ROAD MAP

The program road map shows the high-level plan or vision for the program/projects/phases. It is intended to offer a picture of the lifespan of all the effort that is expected to be required to achieve the business objectives.

| Project/ Phase | Title | Scope Statement | Estimated Months Duration | Estimated Budget |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project 1 | Minimum Viable Product (MVP) | This project will implement ServiceNow and several base modules for knowledge, project, event, change, and incident management as well as a service portal. | 6 | $530,173 |
| Project 2 | Asset and Configuration Management | This project will implement hardware and software asset management into ServiceNow | 6 | $771,223 |
| Project 3 | Service Catalog 1 | This project will begin developing service catalog items in ServiceNow to replace the Work Management System (WMS) | 6 | $833,893.52 |
| Project 4 | Governance, Risk, and Compliance | This project will implement GRC related modules in ServiceNow | 6 | $700,670 |
| Project 5 | MIM Catalog and Integration | This project will remove MIM integration with ServiceNow and replace with IntegrationHub. A catalog item will be created for automating user accounts. | 6 | $386,637.36 |
| Project 6 | Service Catalog 2 | This project will continue developing service catalog items in ServiceNow to replace the Work Management System (WMS) | 6 | $681,832.06 |

## PROJECT BASELINES

The baselines below are entered for only those projects or phases that have been planned. At the completion of a project or phase a new planning effort will occur to baseline the next project/phase and any known actual finish dates and costs for completed projects/phases will be recorded. The iterative report will be submitted again with the new information.

| Project/ Phase | Project/ Phase Start Date | Baseline End Date | Baseline Budget | Funding Source | Actual Finish Date | Schedule Variance | Actual Cost | Cost Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project 1 | 02/11/2020 | 7/27/2020 | $530,173 | Special | 07/21/2020 | 3% Ahead | $510,038 | 4% Under |
| Project 2 | 07/06/2020 | 12/30/2020 | $771,223 | Special | 12/30/2020 | 0% | $771,223 | 0% |
| Project 3 | 07/06/2020 | 12/30/2020 | $833,893 | Special | 12/30/2020 | 0% | $833,893 | 0% |
| Project 4 | 09/28/2020 | 04/01/2021 | $700,670 | Special | 04/21/2021 | 13% Behind | $700,670 | 0% |
| Project 5 | 01/04/2021 | 07/02/2021 | $386,637 | Special | 07/02/2021 | 0% | $336,586 | 12.95% Under |
| Project 6 | 01/04/2021 | 06/30/2021 | $681,832 | Special | 06/30/2021 | 0% | $630,079 | 7% Under |

**Notes:**

Project 1

- Sponsor Approved MVP Project Change Request 003 – add $17,028 for an additional Solutions Architect to the in-flight project to develop a single medium complexity catalog item
- Sponsor Approved MVP Project Change Request 002 – which was a zero cost PCR that removes NDIT functional testing from Sprint 2 deliverables for Milestone Acceptance 3. It was been pushed to begin 5/25/20 after Sprint 4 at the request of the former NDIT program manager, Joe Kwiatkowski. The change was made to accommodate NDIT's resource reassignment to COVID19 activities during April 2020.

Project 5

- Risk Contingency - $11,287 was used of the $30,000 budgeted. This was for IntegrationHub Professional licensing needed for the integrations necessary for the project.
- Project Management - $22,287 was used of the $53,625 budgeted. This was due to a change from full-time to part-time project management mid-project.

Project 6

- Risk Contingency - $12,085 of $30,000 budgeted for risk was used for additional Solution Architect in April 2021.
- Project Management - $22,287 was used of the of $53,625 budgeted. This was due to a change from full-time to part-time project management mid-project.

| Project/ Phase | Business Objective | Measurement Description | Met/ Not Met | Measurement Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project 1 | Transform the User experience with Service Management | Reporting on the following: Enabling a multichannel communication process, introducing chatbots, as well as providing a compelling IT shopping experience with service catalogs and promoting self-help with access to a knowledge base. Measurement of metrics and KPIs using the following reports can gauge the user experience with tends. The IT staff will determine when these reports will need to be run, starting three months after implementation.<br>• SLA compliance rate - Percentage of incidents resolved within the agreed SLA time<br>• Incident response time - Time taken to respond to an event.<br>• Incident resolution time - Time taken to resolve an incident.<br>• Reopen rate - Number of tickets that are reopened after being resolved.<br>• Surveys<br>Need to state this is the baseline at three months with reports showing what? | Met | To measure the short-term improvement of moving from a reactive, monitoring & tracking driven methodology to a proactive practice of identifying and solving potential issues before they happen, the reports following could be used to show improvement for the short term.<br>• Surveys<br>• Collect feedback from end-users (Stakeholders, End users, Technical staff, and management). Feedback can start with a set of identified pilot groups providing feedback and working with others as the tool is better utilized and understood.<br><br>IT and Program staff can start these two weeks after the Go Live date and continue for three months until the reporting matures to allow for metrics to take over. |
| Project 1 | Focus on end-user experience, with engagement web spaces for requests, and maximize self-service | With the implementation of a self-service portal and ND branding, user-friendly interface. Surveys – timing will be determined by the IT staff during the project(s). We can measure this by working to Survey the population and Collect satisfaction feedback from end-users, Survey questions should be framed carefully and be very specific. | Met | There is no lead measurement here, but we will be offering listening sessions to improve the system prior to the survey results measured in the Lag section By listening to the pilot group, Technicians, and requests on the self-service portal inputting those comments and concerns into reports, and determining any corrective actions Redesign, Training, Brown bag sessions that are needed.<br>Listening can start during the User Acceptance testing and continue for the first six months after deployment. |

| Project/ Phase | Business Objective | Measurement Description | Met/ Not Met | Measurement Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project 1 | Utilize real-time analytics to provide information for proactive, cost savings, and more focused preventive actions | The goal of analytics is to manage the cost of ops with a focus on preventive actions resulting in higher and more cost-effective service level achievement. reports monthly starting three months after the go-live date Lost business hours - The goal is to report on the Infrastructure stability - A highly stable infrastructure is characterized by maximum availability, very few outages, and low service disruptions. Change success rate - The goal is to track and report on change efforts, and the number of changes completed successfully in each period. | Met | Reports can measure short term metrics, but the data analytics and trending can be limited due to the lack of historical data – which will be resolved over time.<br><br>Measurement can be via these reports monthly.<br>• Lost business hours – the number of hours the business is down because IT services are unavailable<br>• Change success rate – the ratio of the number of successful changes to the total number of changes that were executed in each timeframe<br>• Cost per event – an overall cost of each event, which is calculated by the support tiers working on that item. The goal is to show cost per events decreasing over time. |
| Project 1 | Provide higher rates of First Level Resolutions (FLR) and self-service opportunities | At the start of this project, the team will survey staff to determine the amount of time they are spending working directly with the customer. Reports that can be run: Ticket volume trends: report goal is to show a slow steady decrease in actual tickets. 1st, call resolution rate. The goal here is to show increasing numbers for First Call Resolutions. % of incidents resolved by the first level of support (first call or contact with the IT help desk). Reopen rate - # of tickets that are reopened after being resolved. Incidents opened via the Self-service portal. The goal here is report on self-service portal usage by users to solve their issues or requests. | Met | For the short-term lead measurement NDIT, and ESM Program staff can start these reports two weeks after the go-live date and continue for three months until the reporting matures to allow for metrics to take over.<br>• Ticket Volume Trends • First Call Resolution Rate<br>• Reopen Rate<br>Requests closed via Self-service portal - Use of Knowledgebase to answer the question. |

| Project/ Phase | Business Objective | Measurement Description | Met/ Not Met | Measurement Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project 2 | Provide Organizational change management (OCM) | Design key Training, Knowledge Transfer and Communications to support | Met | Provide e key Training, Knowledge Transfer and Communications to North Dakota Methods of providing: <br><br>• Knowledge management articles documenting process. <br><br>• Providing job aid documentation <br><br>• Providing Sample OCM Emails <br><br>• Training and communications plans <br><br>• ServiceNow application training (remote) |
| Project 2 | Implement Hardware asset management (HAM) within ServiceNow | At the start of this project, the team will survey staff to determine the methods of tracking software. <br><br>Reports that can be run: <br>• Asset Reports <br>• Spreadsheet tracking <br>• Field input report <br>• Audit Report | Met | Able to use one tool for Software tracking. <br>Reports: <br>• Asset reports <br>• Asset Finical dashboards |
| Project 2 | Implement Software asset management (SAM) within ServiceNow | At the start of this project, the team will survey staff to determine the methods of tracking software. <br><br>Reports that can be run: <br>• Asset Reports <br>• Spreadsheet tracking <br>• Field input report <br>• Audit Report | Met | Able to use one tool for Software tracking. <br>Reports: <br>• Asset reports <br>• Asset Finical dashboards |

| Project/ Phase | Business Objective | Measurement Description | Met/ Not Met | Measurement Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project 3 | Create Service Catalog items withing ServiceNow to replace the Work Management System (WMS) currently in use | Survey the population and collect satisfaction feedback from end-users, identifying their pain points, and visualizing their desired state for further improvement. Survey questions should be framed carefully and be very specific. | Met | To measure the short-term improvement of moving from a reactive, monitoring & tracking driven methodology to a proactive practice of identifying Service requests the reports following could be used to show improvement for the short term.<br><br>• Surveys<br><br>• Collect feedback from end-users (Stakeholders, End users, Technical staff, and management). Feedback can start with a set of identified pilot groups providing feedback and working with others as the tool is better utilized and understood.<br><br>IT and Program staff can start these two weeks after the GO live date and continue for three months until the reporting matures to allow for metrics to take over for the requests. |
| Project 4 | Implement SNow Product GRC - Policy and Compliance Management | Implement product functionality to the acceptance of the Sponsor and Stakeholder(s) | Met | Product successfully implemented |
| Project 4 | Implement SNow Product GRC - Audit Management | Implement product functionality to the acceptance of the Sponsor and Stakeholder(s) | Met | Product successfully implemented |
| Project 4 | Implement SNow Product GRC – Risk Management | Implement product functionality to the acceptance of the Sponsor and Stakeholder(s) | Met | Product successfully implemented |
| Project 4 | Implement SNow Product GRC – Vendor Risk Management | Implement product functionality to the acceptance of the Sponsor and Stakeholder(s) | Met | Product successfully implemented |
| Project 4 | Implement SNow Product Security Operations (SO) module - Vulnerability Response (SOVR) | Implement product functionality to the acceptance of the Sponsor and Stakeholder(s) | Met | Product successfully implemented |
| Project 4 | Provide Administration and User Training | Implement product functionality to the acceptance of the Sponsor and Stakeholder(s) | Met | Product successfully implemented |
| Project 4 | Implement SNow Product GRC - Policy and Compliance Management | Implement product functionality to the acceptance of the Sponsor and Stakeholder(s) | Met | Product successfully implemented |

| Project/ Phase | Business Objective | Measurement Description | Met/ Not Met | Measurement Outcome |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project 4 | Implement SNow Product GRC - Audit Management | Implement product functionality to the acceptance of the Sponsor and Stakeholder(s) | Met | Product successfully implemented |
| Project 5 | Increase the efficiency of Identity Management | Build a service catalog item in ServiceNow to automate creation and deletion of User IDs | Met | IntegrationHub has completely replaced MIM and resulting catalog item automation has removed Identity Management team's MIM work for User IDs |
| Project 6 | Create Service Catalog items withing ServiceNow to replace the Work Management System (WMS) currently in use | Creation of twelve catalog items within ServiceNow to replace WMS items | Met | 13 Service Catalog items were brought from WMS. 1 item was enhanced. |

## POST-IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

Post-Implementation Reports are to be performed after each project or phase is completed. A "PIR" is a process that utilizes surveys and meetings to determine what happened in the project/phase and identifies actions for improvement going forward. Typical PIR findings include, "What did we do well?" "What did we learn?" "What should we do differently next time?"

*If you have a lot of lessons learned, there is no need to include all of them from the PIR. Include the key one here.*

| Project/Phase | Lesson Learned, Success Story, Idea for Next Time, Etc. |
|---|---|
| Project 1 | **What went well?**<br><br>• Outstanding collaboration between NDIT &Vendor (Evergreen)<br>• All in-scope deliverables were completed with high quality results.<br>• Project delivered weeks early, despite a global pandemic and limited client resource availability.<br>• Only 1 project change request used to add an additional scope item (Medium catalog item - IP request).<br>• Project team provided timely feedback on development (despite COVID being their top priority)<br>• Project team actively attended and participated in twice weekly project meetings<br>• The perfect people were assigned as your Process Owner/Manager roles. They were very knowledgeable about their areas of expertise and empowered to make decisions. All of them spent a considerable amount of time improving their application & process.<br>• Vendor input - Outstanding collaboration between ND Program Manager and EVG Program Manager. Met often to sync up on strategy, plans and deliverable status. Vendor felt it was a true business partnership.<br>• 2-year strategic roadmap created<br>• We were very disciplined as a team about not customizing the application. This is VERY difficult to achieve.<br>• ND Team was very receptive to feedback and guidance.<br>• Extensive OCM completed:<br>1. Live Best Practices Workshop Training (On-site)<br>2. Live ServiceNow Application Training (remote)<br>3. Step-by-step application job aids<br>4. Training & Communications Plans<br>5. Design Docs<br>6. Sample OCM Emails<br><br>**What could have gone better?**<br><br>• More extensive UAT testing during the designated timeframe involving end users as well.<br>• More detailed requirements specs provided during discovery to avoid last minute critical requirements (e.g., public facing incident form after UAT complete)<br>• More contact between project sponsors to discuss strategic alignment |

| Project 2 | **What went well?** |
|---|---|
| | <ul><li>Great collaboration between Evergreen and ND core team. Regular meetings, status updates, and frequent communication.</li><li>High quality deliverables achieved</li><li>Measured both the CSAT and Process Maturity scores to get a benchmark to measure the improvements</li><li>Agile approach of regularly showing WIP and gathering feedback ensured that the deliverables met team needs</li><li>Formal release management and change management processes were identified, documented, and followed</li><li>Extensive high-quality documentation provided for all 7 projects including design docs, UAT scripts, job aids and workshops</li><li>Major improvements made to Core Data</li><li>Flawless Paris upgrade completed with very few issues and clear communication</li><li>Great collaboration between Program Managers (roadmaps, contracts, project planning etc.</li></ul><br>**What could have gone better?**<ul><li>Requirements gathering for all 7 projects was informal and regularly changing throughout the lifecycle of each deliverable<ul><li>Add an NDIT business analyst to core teams</li><li>Suggest NDIT hold internal requirements gathering sessions with SMEs & business analyst prior to meeting with EVG</li><li>Require requirements sign-off in ServiceNow on all stories prior to development</li><li>Start new stories, get formal approval for all major requirements changes and push the release date for overall deliverable</li></ul></li><li>UAT testing was informal<ul><li>Formalize UAT scripts</li></ul></li><li>ServiceNow & Asset Panda data did not tie initially<ul><li>Created detailed action plan & go-live plan</li><li>Worked with ServiceNow to resolve the data bug</li><li>Created 2 reports to audit Asset data</li><li>Audited ServiceNow to Asset Panda data to ensure tied (should have been done early)</li><li>Met with Brandee daily for 2 months</li><li>Extensive documentation on Asset in SN</li><li>Extensive knowledge transfer sessions</li><li>Extensive data clean-up within ServiceNow done by EVG</li></ul></li><li>Significant Core Data Issues<ul><li>Data issues with Active Directory, Location, Dept, Division, Cost Centers, Users, Models. Model Categories</li><li>Assign Asset Manager & Asset Sys Admin immediately</li><li>Stand-up a Master Data Management program</li><li>Define & document all of your Asset & Config processes (both financial & config)</li><li>Edit the RACI to determine & authorize Asset & Config roles</li><li>NDIT to clean data prior to sending to EVG to upload</li></ul></li><li>Lack of clarify of what is being completed for each project<ul><li>Work only from approved stories to clarify exactly what is/isn't in scope.</li><li>Clearly state and reiterate what customer will receive throughout the project.</li><li>Maintain an Issues Log for items that are not in scope, but escalated as an issue for future work</li><li>Continue to post action items, meeting notes, status reports and decision logs in OneNote. Add link to the file in the meeting invite.</li><li>Send out meeting notes and ask NDIT team to review it to ensure it's accurate (joint responsibility for accuracy</li></ul></li><li>Emergency ServiceNow version upgrade<ul><li>Turn off automatic version upgrades with ServiceNow</li><li>Put an annual upgrade in the schedule every year (planned)</li></ul></li></ul> |

| Project/ Phase | Lesson Learned, Success Story, Idea for Next Time, Etc. |
|---|---|
| Project 3 | **What went well?**<br><br>• Great collaboration between Evergreen and ND core team. Regular meetings, status updates, frequent communication.<br>• High quality deliverables achieved<br>• Measuring both the CSAT and Process Maturity scores to get a benchmark to visualize improvements<br>• Agile approach of regularly showing WIP and gathering feedback ensured that the deliverables met team needs<br>• Formal release management and change management processes were identified, documented, and followed<br>• Extensive high-quality documentation provided including design docs, UAT scripts, job aids, and workshops<br>• ATFs created for all major catalog items<br>• Flawless Paris upgrade completed with very few issues and clear communication<br>• Great collaboration between Program Managers (roadmaps, contracts, project planning etc.)<br><br>**What could have gone better?**<br>• Requirements gathering for all 7 projects was informal and regularly changing throughout the lifecycle of each deliverable.<br>   o Add an NDIT business analyst to core teams<br>   o Suggest NDIT hold internal requirements gathering sessions with SMEs & business analyst prior to meeting with EVG.<br>   o Require requirements sign-off in ServiceNow on all stories prior to development.<br>   o Start new stories, get formal approval for all major requirements changes and push the release date for overall deliverable.<br>• UAT testing was informal<br>   o Formalize UAT scripts<br>• Lack of clarity of what is being completed for each project<br>   o Work only from approved stories to clarify exactly what is/isn't in scope.<br>   o Clearly state and reiterate what customer will receive throughout the project.<br>   o Maintain an Issues Log for items that are not in scope, but escalated as an issue for future work<br>   o Continue to post action items, meeting notes, status reports and decision logs in OneNote. Add link to the file in the meeting invite.<br>   o Send out meeting notes and ask NDIT team to review it to ensure it's accurate (joint responsibility for accuracy)<br>• Emergency ServiceNow version upgrade<br>   o Turn off automatic version upgrades with ServiceNow o Put an annual upgrade in the schedule every year (planned) |

| Project/ Phase | Lesson Learned, Success Story, Idea for Next Time, Etc. |
|---|---|
| Project 4 | **What went well?**<br>• Pre-created Stories for Requirements Workshops<br>• Story Review and Approval<br>• Solid UAT process<br>• Built a CI-level Policy Exception Process with Extension Capability<br>• Configuring the UCF integration<br>• Reporting on Control Status and Substatus<br>• Approval Rules Documentation for New Policies<br>• Tenable SecurityCenter Vulnerability Integration Configuration including Tenable VPR score<br>• Vulnerability Reporting<br>• Accurate scoping of Vendor/Government Entity Vendor Risk Assessments<br>• Vendor Manager Reporting<br>• Un-cluttered Existing CyGRC Reporting<br>• Assessment Automation<br>• Risk Response Process for Government Entity Stakeholders<br>• Risk Re-assessment Process<br>• Remediation Status and POA&M Fields Added to Risk Form<br>• CAM Application Configuration<br>• Automatic Import of Pre-Defined Risks from NDIT GRC<br>• Developed Automated Mapping For Future UCF regulatory Content to the GRC team's New Process in ServiceNow<br>• State Agency Auditing Enhancements<br>• Audit Process Configuration<br>• Configured Business Continuity Management<br>• Automate Remediation Team and Task Creation from Assurance COOP Report Import<br>• Import HCL Appscan Issues/Vulnerabilities<br>• Knowledge Transfer<br>• Uriah's GRC Team Leadership<br><br>**What could have gone better?**<br>• Overly Aggressive Timeline<br>• Conveying Expectations of an Aggressive Timeline within NDIT<br>• Lack of Process Focus<br>• Scoping Reporting Requirements<br>• Customer Driven Acceptance Criteria<br>• Formal Training<br>• Lack of GRC-Specific Application Support<br>• AD integration Issues |

| Project/ Phase | Lesson Learned, Success Story, Idea for Next Time, Etc. |
|---|---|
| Project 5 | **What went well?**<br>• NDIT & Thirdera worked well together overall<br>• NDIT team thoroughly considered requirements, preventing future rework.<br>• The project's original intent was to integration ServiceNow with MIMs but changed to removing MIMs completely.<br>• Established meetings, meeting notes, meetings were kept on-time, general meeting cadence went very well<br><br>**What could have gone better?**<br>• Some requirements were received late that strained development timeline<br>• UAT had few participants<br>• Enhancement requests after acceptance delayed implementation<br>• Lack of due dates for requirement submission strained development timelines<br>• Documented requirements for specific use cases were not sufficient |
| Project 6 | **What went well?**<br>• NDIT & Thirdera worked well together overall<br>• NDIT team thoroughly considered requirements, preventing future rework.<br>• WMS items brought across were significantly upgraded to improve the work processes.<br>• Extensive and varied documentation provided by vendor.<br>• NDIT staff were well-engaged.<br>• Stakeholder engagement was critical<br><br>**What could have gone better?**<br>• Not enough time was spent intaking complex catalog items to fully realize requirements.<br>• Too many meetings.<br>• Staff not needed were kept on meeting invites, poor use of their time.<br>• Vendor determined some requirements as enhancements, even when they were contributed as requirements.<br>• Too few UAT testers and UAT was not thorough enough.<br>• Not enough time spent on planning lead to strained development cycles and delaying solution delivery |

## KEY CONSTRAINTS AND/OR RISKS

**Risk – COVID-19 –** Pandemic impacts on project team's operational work could jeopardize project schedule.

**Risk - Disconnect between ND and Contractor on requirements -** Disconnect between ND and EVG on requirements being given to design and configure by. ND provided requirements are short and generic, when EVG designs and configures to those specs the returned piece of work is missing the mark according to the ND resources. Looking at the requirements from ND they are not mentioning the parts needed in detail enough for the vendor to understand the specifics of what the ask is.

**Risk – NDGOV Account Creation has Inter-agency Impacts -** In the MIMS Integration and Catalog Item project there is an opportunity to introduce new automations to the NDGOV creation process. This however has impacts on HR and other agencies.