|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | **Project Status Report** Initiative-162: Incident/Critical ManagementAs of 5/14/2021 | **Project Manager:** Elizabeth White**Project Sponsor:** Jeff Vail |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Initiative Number:** 162 | **ETSC Priority:** N/A | **Project Scheduled Completion Date:** TBD | **Project Lifecycle:**  Execution |
| **Project Description:** IT currently routes Service Requests and Incidents through the same process making no distinction between the two. This causes internal misrouting and delayed customer response. This project will improve our Service Model to provide a much stronger Incident Management process by distinguishing Incidents from Service Requests. |
| **Scope:** | **GREEN = No issues** | **Schedule:** | **GREEN = No issues** | **Resources:** | **GREEN = No issues** |
| **Milestones** | **Start Date** | **End Date** | **Actual****End Date** | **% Complete** | **Actions/Comments** |
| Sprint 5 – Post-Incident Review (PIR) | 04/08/2021 | 04/23/2021 | 04/23/2021 | 100% | Completed PIR & Post-Mortem Report  |
| System Test Execution | 02/22/2021 | 05/06/2021 | 04/23/2021 | 100% | Completed System Testing, IT-2928 task closed |
| UAT Incident System | 05/01/2021 | 05/20/2021 |  | 70% | Started 4/26/2021, IT-2751 in progress |
| Incident Process Documentation | 09/01/2020 | 05/21/2021 |  | 95% | Sent for review and approval |
| Communicate Incident Process | TBD | TBD |  | 0% | David Stoffel has agreed to help with communicating change across the organization |
| Training | TBD | TBD |  | 0% | BA Resource |
| Implement Incident & Service Request Systems |  | Sep/Oct |  |  | Preliminary plan is to implement the Incident & Service Request systems together |

| **IT Task #** | **Completed Activities This Reporting Period** | **Planned Activities for Next Reporting Period** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| IT-2905 &IT-2906IT-3450IT-3237IT-3239IT-3242IT-3236 | * Sprint #5 – Review & Retrospective conducted 5/5,

 tasks closed* + Submitted Post-Incident Review (PIR) Diagram and Post-Mortem template to sponsors on 4/27/2021for final approval
* Updated the SOPs, team approval received 5/13. Submitted for sponsor final approval 5/13.

Completed Test Case #8 – Pend Status, task closedTest Case #10 Management Escalation, task cancelled team determined management escalation to be a manual process and no JSD testing requiredCompleted Test Case #13 – Administration, task closedCompleted Test Case #7 – PIR, task closedDocumented UAT Test Scenario Placeholders | * Continue executing UAT
* Continue developing the technical specification about 20% complete
* Receive final approvals on the SOPs, PIR, and Desk Agent Guides
 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Risks** | **Probability** | **Impact** | **Status** |
| IT Customer Services Team may not be ready to engage in UAT testing when needed due to a County-wide Microsoft upgrade | High | Low | Update on Target completion date 4/16 for Microsoft upgrade to be completed. This is being mitigated by engaging a IT Customer Services service desk agent early during system testing.  |
| BA Resource is currently involved in many other projects and maybe stretched too thin to complete some of the tasks that are needed for Incident Management: 1) system testing, 2) coordinating UAT, 3) finishing project documentation, and 4) preparing training materials & training the JSD agents. | Not yet Realized | Medium | Mitigating the system testing by employing a IT Customer service desk agent to help out with system testing. PM can step in to help coordinate UAT and finish some of the project documentation. However, preparing training materials and training the JSD agents will need to be done by the BA resource who is familiar with working the service desk. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Issues** | **Impact** | **Priority** | **Status** |
| No Key Issues to Report |  |  |  |