WPSS:
Background and RCA summary

Larry Buttress
and
Robin Furrer

TIPSC Meeting

11/15/2012

Background

- WPSS was to be a centralized planning and scheduling system for Transmission, for both capital and expense work.
- One of eight automation projects Transmission launched as a result of the Enterprise Process Improvement Program.
- Selected vendor, ClickSoftware, in February 2009.
- Invested $6.43 million in the software, installation and efforts to configure the software.
  - Capital: $6.14 million
  - Expense: $292k
- In November 2011, we conducted an alternative analysis and re-evaluated options for the project.
- We ended the project in February 2012 because it had not delivered the solution we were looking for at the expected cost; The $6.14m capital was written off.

Why Did The Project Fail?

Inadequate Strategic Planning

- We launched multiple TPIP projects simultaneously.
- Poor sequencing of projects; WPSS depended upon data that would be created (later) in other automation projects.
- Business transformation wasn't conducted as necessary first step.
- Many temporary and time consuming solutions were developed to manually load data.
- Vendor couldn't deliver on reporting requirements, per contract.

Compressed Timeline and Inadequate Staffing

- Underestimated the challenges of implementing the COTS software.
- Misjudged the business changes necessary for success.
- Project schedule didn't account for true complexity of effort.
- Project wasn't adequately staffed.

Why Did The Project Fail? (cont.)

Inadequate Protocols for Responding to Troubled Projects

- Project team and governing bodies had an interest in project's success.
- The team believed the software could be made to work, with a little more effort, to meet the needs.
- There was no clear trigger point to re-evaluate the project and the business case.

Insufficient Vendor Research and Management

- Made insufficient use of customer references.
- Allowed the vendor to facilitate and accompany us on trips to customer reference sites.
- Lack of coordination between Transmission and IT, resulting in a less than adequate statement of work.

What Changes Will BPA Make?

- Added new vendor selection requirements to our IT System Lifecycle (SLC) standards.
- Requirement to conduct alternatives analysis in the planning phase.
- Transmission established a function to prioritize and sequence process improvement efforts.
- Better align resource availability with project work.
- Identifying threshold for troubled projects and clarifying roles and responsibilities of the governing bodies.
- Modified software testing standards in vendor selection phase.
- Improved coordination between IT, Transmission, and Supply Chain in developing statement of work and establishing meaningful contract milestones.
- BPA Administrator, Chief Operating Officer, Chief Information Officer, and Transmission executives have identified specific actions/commitments toward continuous improvement.

What Did BPA Gain From This Project?

- Helped improve Transmission's planning and scheduling of resources.
- Creation of two new work groups devoted to work planning and scheduling (Field Services) and project management analysis and scheduling (Engineering).
- SharePoint scheduling system for field work.
- Adoption of demand planning for real and forecast work.
- Tied demand planning to budget at a centralized level.
- Maturing "availability to promise" planning function.
- With these improvements, Transmission Services has doubled its annual capital budget and improved its ability to meet in-service dates by 13 percent.
- Drove the creation of a formalized RCA (root cause analysis) process, modeled after Accident Investigation Board format.
- Improved commitment to sharing lessons learned.

Questions?