

Information Technology Executive Council

Standard 2400-S

1.0 Information Technology Project Plan Approval and Project Status Reporting

1.1 Effective Date: July 1, 2023

1.2 Type of Action: Update

2.0 PURPOSE: [K.S.A. 75-7209](#) and [ITEC-2400-P](#) require that whenever a state agency, in any branch of government, proposes a qualifying information technology (IT) project, the agency must prepare a project plan and submit it to the Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO) of the agency's branch. The project plan is required to provide specific information, as detailed in this document, and must be approved by the branch CITO before implementation of the project begins. ITEC-2400-P requires branch CITO approval twice in the commencement of an IT project: first *prior to procurement activity*, and then, with additional information reported, *prior to the project entering execution*. The KITO Approval and Reporting System (KARS), described herein, is provided to manage the process of IT project plan submittal, review, and approval.

3.0 ORGANIZATIONS AFFECTED: All Branches, Boards, Commissions, Departments, Divisions, and Agencies of state government, hereafter referred to as entities.

4.0 REFERENCES:

4.1 [ITEC-2400-P](#) – Information Technology Project Plan and Project Status Reporting

4.2 K.S.A. 75-7203 authorizes ITEC to: Adopt information resource policies and procedures and provide direction and coordination for the application of the state's information technology resources for all state agencies.

4.3 KARS Help Center – KITO Approval and Reporting System Help Center. Online help center providing training guidance materials to assist users in the use of KARS.

4.4 [State of Kansas Project Management Methodology](#)

5.0 DEFINITIONS:

5.1 **CITO** – refers to the Executive, Judicial, or Legislative Branch Chief Information Technology Officer, with duties as defined in K.S.A. 75-7205, et seq.

5.2 **Cumulative cost** means “the total expenditures, from all sources, for any information technology project by one or more state agencies to meet project objectives from project start to project completion or the date and time the project is terminated if it is not completed.”

5.3 **Executive Authority** refers to the head of the state entity proposing the project.

5.4 **ITEC** – Refers to the Information Technology Executive Council.

5.5 **Information Technology Project** – [K.S.A. 75-7201\(c\)](#) defines an information technology project as “an information technology effort by a state agency of defined and limited duration that implements, effects a change in or presents a risk to processes, services, security, systems, records, data, human resources or architecture.”

5.6 **Project** - means a planned series of events or activities that is intended to accomplish a specified outcome in a specified time period, under consistent management direction within a state agency or shared among two or more state agencies, and that has an identifiable budget for anticipated expenses.

5.7 The **KITO Approval and Reporting System (KARS)** is the online system used to submit project plan information for evaluation by the Kansas Information Technology Office (KITO) and approval by the branch CITO.

In KARS, a project plan submitted for initial branch CITO approval is termed a **demand** and includes high-level information about the proposed initiative. Subsequently, while being prepared for the second branch CITO approval and thereafter, it is designated in the system as a **project** and includes much more detailed information.

This system collects the required information and makes it available for review by the designated parties at the appropriate phases of the process. Per ITEC-2400-P, two separate branch CITO approvals must take place:

1. *Prior to procurement* – referred to as branch CITO approval to procure.
2. *Prior to execution* – referred to as branch CITO approval to execute.

5.7 **Specifications** refers to the “specifications” section of any task order, proposal, or request for proposal (RFP).

6.0 Standards:

6.1 IT Project Plan Approval Requirements – In accordance with K.S.A. 75-7201, IT projects deemed with significant risk according to the risk assessment outlined in section 6.2 are required to be submitted, obtain branch CITO approval of their plans, and report status, all through KARS. These are often called “reportable” IT projects, to distinguish them from those that are not subject to these approval and reporting requirements.

Project plans for IT projects with an estimated cumulative cost of \$10,000,000 or more must include, in addition to the information ordinarily required, (1) an options and feasibility assessment, and (2) documentation of independent verification and validation (IV&V) oversight pursuant to the requirements of [ITEC-2410-P](#). KARS will require these tasks for IT projects meeting this cost threshold.

6.2 The *Kansas IT Business Risk Assessment* is a staged risk assessment carried out in KARS. Tasks relating to the Business Risk Assessment stages will be assigned by KARS as necessary.

6.2.1 The first stage of the Kansas Business Risk Assessment is the *Business Risk Screening*. The Business Risk Screening is a brief set of questions that must be completed for all proposed IT projects.

6.2.1.1 Business Risk Screening outcomes:

6.2.1.1.1 “No Further Business Risk Evaluation is Required.” The Kansas IT Business Risk Assessment is complete. The proposed IT project is not reportable.

6.2.1.1.2 “Further Business Risk Evaluation is Required.” A second stage of the Kansas IT Business Risk Assessment, described in Section 6.2.2, must be completed. This will determine whether the proposed IT project is reportable.

6.2.2 The second stage is the *Business Risk Evaluation*, which involves detailed risk questions regarding five primary categories: Strategic, Operational, Financial, Reputational, and Security and Compliance. The results determine business risk level and need for additional reporting.

6.2.2.1 Business Risk Evaluation Outcomes:

6.2.2.1.1 The proposed IT Project is deemed not reportable, and no further action is required in KARS.

6.2.2.1.2 The proposed IT Project is deemed reportable and must proceed with the IT Project Plan Approval Process.

6.3 IT Project Plan Approval Process – as noted above, IT project plan information is submitted for approval, first as a *demand* and then again later as a *project*, online through KARS. Specific usage instructions for KARS are provided in the KARS Help Center. The basic stages of the process are described below.

6.3.1 Demand

6.3.1.1 Demand Overview – A *demand* (formerly known as a high-level project plan) is a strategic or operational IT initiative for which an agency must request branch CITO review and approval to proceed with procurement. The branch CITO demand approval is the first of two approval gates in the approval and reporting process, as required by statute and reinforced by the Joint Committee on Information Technology (JCIT).

The initial project data (demand data) is entered by the agency into the demand application in KARS and includes high-level, estimated information about a proposed IT initiative. The demand is first submitted to KITO for evaluation and acceptance. Once the demand has gained KITO acceptance, it is delivered to the branch CITO for review and approval. The branch CITO demand approval authorizes the state agency to proceed into procurement.

The demand process is divided into four stages:

6.3.1.2 Draft – Demand creation begins with the state agency completing a Demand Intake Form through the OITS service catalog. Upon submission of the demand intake form, a unique demand number is created. High-level information describing the proposed IT project is collected in the draft demand record. Information concerning estimated effort, cost, risk, benefit, etc., is required to analyze a demand and create a business case for evaluation by the KITO and approval by the branch CITO.

6.3.1.2.1 Information required in the draft demand record:

- **IT initiative information** is required, including business case, project duration, financials, funding source(s), cost plans, benefit plans, and risks. For additional information, along with KARS procedures, please visit the KARS Help Center.
- **Options and feasibility analysis** information is required if a proposed demand is over \$10 million to ensure sufficiency of planning, resulting in thorough market research, options analysis, and justification for the selected option.

- **Compliance acknowledgements** consist of agency review, acknowledgement, and agreement to comply with policies and regulations pertaining to:
 - *Architecture* – compliance with ITEC Policies [4010](#) and [9500](#).
 - *Ownership of Software Code and Intellectual Property* – compliance with [ITEC-1500-P](#).
 - *Accessibility* – compliance with [ITEC-1210-P](#).
 - *Electronic Records Retention* – compliance with [K.S.A. 45-403](#) and [K.S.A. 45-215 through 45-223](#).
 - *Security* – compliance with ITEC-[7230-P](#).
 - *Data Compliance* - compliance with the [ITEC-8010-P](#).

For additional information and requirements regarding compliance acknowledgements in the demand phase, along with KARS procedures, please visit the KARS Help Center.

- **Specifications** related to a proposed demand shall be submitted for branch CITO approval per [K.S.A. 75-7209](#).

For additional information and requirements regarding specifications in the demand phase, along with KARS procedures, please visit the KARS Help Center.

- The **Executive Authority Approval** provides entity authorization for the demand to be submitted for CITO approval. The executive authority approval is granted via response to a system-generated email message sent to the executive authority.

6.3.1.3 Screening – A demand enters the screening stage upon the state agency’s submission of the draft demand form to KITO. Screening ensures that all required information is thorough and accurate in preparation for the branch CITO review and approval.

Once a demand has gained KITO acceptance, the KITO team will facilitate the branch CITO approval through KARS.

6.3.1.4 Qualified – A demand is qualified upon KITO acceptance of the required demand information. A standard subset of the demand information provided in KARS will be sent to:

- The members of the Joint Committee of Information Technology (JCIT) will have seven business days to review the demand information and individually provide feedback through KARS or request a meeting with the submitting agency. If a meeting is requested, it must be scheduled within two weeks of the meeting request. Any feedback received will be logged in the demand record in KARS and provided to the branch CITO for consideration.

- The branch CITO for review and approval.
 - Approval by the branch CITO will move the demand to the Approved stage.
 - Rejection by the branch CITO will result in the return of the demand to draft state. The KITO team will then facilitate communication with the agency to address any deficiencies, outstanding questions, comments, or suggestions for potential resubmission.

6.3.1.5 Approved – When a demand has received branch CITO approval, **the state agency is thereby authorized to procure**. An executive summary of the approved demand will be sent to the Division of the Budget, JCIT, all three branch CITO, the Office of Procurement and Contracts, and the Legislative Research Department.

The branch CITO approval triggers KARS to promote the demand to a *project* for the agency to update their project plan, in detail, to be submitted for branch CITO approval to execute.

6.3.2 Project

6.3.2.1 Project Overview – In KARS, a *project* (formerly known as a detailed-level project plan) is a strategic or operational IT initiative that has received demand approval, for which an agency must request branch CITO review and approval to proceed with execution. The branch CITO approval to execute is the second of two approval gates in the approval and reporting process, as required by statute and reinforced by JCIT.

All demand data is transferred to the project upon branch CITO demand approval. When specifics are fully determined, such as after the selection of a vendor, the project plan data is updated by the agency in the project application in KARS to include comprehensive, detailed information about the proposed IT initiative. The project is first submitted to KITO for evaluation and acceptance. Once the project has gained KITO acceptance, it is delivered to the branch CITO for review and approval. The CITO project plan approval authorizes the state agency to begin execution of the IT project.

6.3.2.2 Information required for approval in the project form:

6.3.2.2.1 IT initiative information

6.3.2.2.1.1 All IT initiative information is transferred from the approved demand and shall be updated in the project with more refined and detailed information, as needed.

- A **business case** justifies the project and describes the business risks (challenges and/or opportunities) that led the organization to consider pursuing the initiative.
- **Project milestones** are required to identify high priority tasks, checkpoints, and deliverables.

- **Financials**, including, but not limited to:
 - **Cost plans** to estimate all costs related to the project, with fiscal period and cost type information.
 - **Benefit plans** to communicate the quantitative and qualitative benefits clearly and concisely to be realized by the project.
 - **On-going cost estimates** including ongoing cost of ownership and estimated life of solution.
 - **Funding source(s)**
 - **Project risk** identification describes potential risk events; the timeframe they may occur; the probability of occurrence; the impacts, should they occur; and identified mitigation plans for each risk.

6.3.2.2.2 **Options and feasibility analysis** information is required if a proposed project is over \$10 million to ensure: sufficiency of planning; thorough market research; options analysis; and justification for the selected option. Projects over \$5 million are recommended to conduct this analysis. For additional information and requirements regarding the options and feasibility analysis, please visit the KARS Help Center.

6.3.2.2.3 **Compliance evaluations and approvals** consist of information confirming compliance with policies and regulations pertaining to the following. Review and approval of the provided information will be facilitated in KARS. For additional information and requirements regarding compliance evaluations and approvals, please visit the KARS Help Center.

- *Architecture* – compliance with ITEC Policies [4010](#) and [9500](#).
- *Ownership of Software Code and Intellectual Property* – compliance with [ITEC-1500-P](#).
- *Accessibility* – compliance with [ITEC-1210-P](#).
- *Electronic Records Retention* – compliance with [K.S.A. 45-403](#) and [K.S.A. 45-215 through 45-223](#).
- *Security* – compliance with [ITEC-7230-P](#).
- *Data Compliance* - compliance with the [ITEC-8010-P](#).

6.3.2.3 An IT **Project Risk Assessment** must be completed in KARS. The IT Project Risk Assessment assists the branch CITO and state project managers with quantifying and summarizing information on IT project risks. It breaks down IT project risk into four areas of focus: Business Environment, Project Management, Strategy, and Technology. A project receives a risk score in each area of focus, and the scores are scaled against a calibrated index to show high, medium, and low risk. The objective is

to provide the branch CITO and the project manager with focus areas for risk mitigation.

For additional information and requirement regarding compliance acknowledgements in demand, along with KARS procedures, please visit the KARS Help Center.

6.3.2.4 The **Executive Authority Approval** provides entity authorization for the project to be submitted for CITO approval. The executive authority approval is granted via response to a system-generated email message sent to the executive authority.

6.4 **IT Project Reporting** – Overview – [K.S.A 75-7211](#) directs the branch CITO, under the direction of JCIT, to monitor state entity execution of information technology projects. Reporting on project performance status shall occur at times agreed upon by the three chief information technology officers..

To facilitate the evaluation of progress on IT projects, state agencies will submit regular project status reports to the CITO of their branch. KARS also handles the collection of these project status reports for active projects.

6.4.1 **Reporting Metrics** – The following measures have been established as the basis to evaluate project status. Agencies should provide these measures through KARS. Additional information should explain the causes of any deviations from the plan and the associated corrective actions initiated with the expected results of the actions and impact upon the original plan. Policy, legislative, or public issues related to the project should also be covered as amplifying information.

6.4.1.1 **Critical Path.** The Project Manager should provide a project report on the critical path showing actual progress versus planned progress. If the project is behind schedule, the project manager should provide a concise narrative with data showing the time units behind schedule, the time units behind schedule as a percentage of the cumulative time units to date for the project, and the plan to recover the lost time.

6.4.1.1.1 Critical Path 10% to 20% behind schedule. If the critical path tasks are 10% to 20% behind schedule, the project will be reported in a yellow or caution status and there shall be evidence of sponsor review of the project and approval of the recovery plan. A concise statement of that recovery plan, the expected results, and the anticipated impact upon the project shall be provided.

6.4.1.1.2 Critical Path 20% to 30% behind schedule. If the critical path tasks are 20 % to 30% behind schedule, the project will be reported in a red or alert status. The agency head shall have approved the recovery plan. A concise statement of that recovery plan, the expected results, and the anticipated impact upon the project shall be provided.

6.4.1.1.3 Critical Path more than 30% behind schedule. If the critical path tasks are more than 30% behind schedule, the project will be reported in a red status with recast required. The project is considered unrecoverable, and a recast project plan will be required. The Recast Project Plan will require agency head and branch CITO approvals and will be submitted in KARS. When feasible in relation to the project's schedule and cost, the agency head should consider recommending that an independent third party be obtained to conduct a project review

and make recommendations regarding causes for the project deviation from plan, corrective actions needed, expected outcomes, and whether the project should be continued.

- 6.4.1.2 **Milestone Completion Rate.** A milestone is a clearly identifiable object that results from completion of a major phase of work. The project manager should report on the actual number of milestones completed for the project versus the planned number of milestones to be completed for the project through the date of the report.
- 6.4.1.2.1 **Milestone Completion Rate Behind Schedule.** If the project is behind schedule, the project manager shall provide a concise narrative stating the causes, the plan to recover the milestone completion rate, the expected results, and the anticipated impact upon the project.
 - 6.4.1.2.2 **Milestone Completion Rate of 80% to 90%.** If the milestone completion rate is in the range of 80% to 90%, the project will be reported in a yellow or caution status. There shall be evidence of review and approval of the recovery plan by the sponsor. The plan of actions to achieve an acceptable milestone completion rate shall be concisely stated with the expected results and the anticipated impact upon the project.
 - 6.4.1.2.3 **Milestone Completion Rate of 70% to 80%.** If the project has a milestone completion rate of 70% to 80%, the project will be reported in a red or alert status. The plan of actions to achieve an acceptable milestone completion rate shall have been approved by the agency head. The recovery plan shall be concisely stated with progress and expected results and anticipated impact upon the project.
 - 6.4.1.2.4 **Milestone Completion Rate of less than 70%.** If the project has a milestone completion rate of less than 70%, the project will be reported in a red status with recast required. The project is considered unrecoverable, and a recast project plan will be required. The Recast Project Plan will require agency head and branch CITO approvals and will be submitted in KARS. The agency head should consider recommending that an independent third party be obtained to conduct a project review and make recommendations regarding causes for the project deviation from plan, corrective actions needed, expected outcomes, and whether the project the project should be continued.
- 6.4.1.3 **Cost.** The project cost plans should show the major categories of costs by capital expenditures, operational expenditures, and KITO oversight rate. Reports shall show the actual cumulative total spent versus the original planned expenditure through the end of the reporting quarter.
- 6.4.1.3.1 **Deviation from Cost Plan By 10% to 20%.** If the actual costs exceed planned costs by 10% to 20%, the project will be reported in a yellow or caution status and the impact on the total project cost must be examined. If the total cost of the project has been increased, the return on investment will be reduced. The sponsor should have reviewed the project, determined whether there has been a change in the schedule of costs and determined whether changes in the project should be

initiated to recover the original cost plan. The recovery plan, expected results, and anticipated impact upon the project shall be concisely reported.

When actual cumulative costs deviate from the planned costs, the percent of cumulative actual costs versus cumulative planned cost shall be stated and the deviation explained. Further, if total project costs are projected to be 10% over the planned costs or \$1,000,000, whichever is less, then by statute the deviation must be shared with JCIT. The Joint Committee will notify the House Appropriations, Senate Ways and Means, and Legislative Budget Committees and make any recommendations deemed appropriate.

6.4.1.3.2 Deviation from cost plan by 20% to 30%. If actual costs exceed planned costs by 20% to 30%, the project will be reported in red or alert status. A review should have previously been done to determine if an increase in costs has occurred and if so, how the increase can be mitigated. The recovery plan should have been acted upon and the agency head should have reviewed the results of the plan. The agency head should have approved continuation of work or expense on the project. A recovery plan must be submitted as part of the quarterly report.

6.4.1.3.2.1 Deviation from cost plan more than 30% behind schedule. If the actual costs exceed planned costs by more than 30%, the project will be reported in a red status with recast required. The project is considered unrecoverable, and a recast project plan will be required. The recast project plan will require agency head and branch CITO approvals and will be submitted in KARS. The agency head should consider recommending that an independent third party be obtained to conduct a project review and make recommendations regarding causes for the project deviation from plan, corrective actions needed, expected outcomes, and whether the project should be continued.

6.4.2 **Risk Report.** The above measures have been addressed individually, however, when a project has experienced difficult problems or issues, the impact may be reflected in more than one measure permitting a broader assessment of project status. The project manager should consider all of the above measures and make an assessment of the risk and likely impacts upon the project's scope, budget, schedule, and the business or technical infrastructure objectives to be achieved in the original plan. The project manager will update risks entered into KARS quarterly, at a minimum. These risks will be included as part of the quarterly project status report review.

6.4.3 **Reporting Frequency** – A project status report is required by the end of day of the last day of each quarter. Status reports will be submitted in KARS. Email reminders will be sent to the Project Managers two weeks and again one week prior to the end of the quarter. Reporting quarters are:

- January - March
- April - June
- July - September
- October - December

6.4.4 Reporting Process

6.4.4.1 Upon approval by the branch CITO, the project is considered in “active” status. Project managers must monitor project health and begin status reporting at the close of each calendar quarter.

6.4.4.2 Quarterly project status reports will be submitted in KARS.

6.4.4.3 Status reports will be scored with one of the following project ratings:

- Green: Satisfactory, no corrective action or recovery plan necessary. The current risk to overall project quality and outcome is low.
- Yellow: Caution, risks/issues exist but the IT project is currently addressing them. There may be a need for corrective action and recovery plan now or in the near future.
- Red: Significant risk to the IT project. Escalated for immediate corrective action, requiring a recovery plan or a recast of the project plan.

6.4.5 **Publication of Reported Information** – KITO will compile the information provided in the quarterly status reports into a comprehensive Summary of Quarterly IT Status Reports for dissemination to JCIT members, branch CITO, State Budget Director, and posted on the website.

6.5 IT Project Close-Out

6.5.1 State organizations must maintain procedures for conducting lessons learned on IT projects during a project close-out process. Close-out is determined when project objectives have been met and users have reviewed and accepted the system.

6.5.2 The process requires preparation of a Post Implementation Evaluation Report (PIER) to capture lessons learned and archival of project records.

6.5.3 Standards for Project Close-Out

6.5.3.1 The key elements associated with project close-out include:

- Re-disbursement of resources,
- completion and archiving of project records,
- documentation of the successes and issues associated with the project,
- celebrating success of the project, and
- conducting a lessons-learned session.

The purpose of conducting a formal project close-out is to document lessons learned, this means that problems that were encountered by the project team must be able to be openly presented so that process improvements can occur to eliminate the causes. It is important that the discussions do not merely point a finger away from the project team; responsibility for problem areas must be completely discussed. It is helpful to conduct an interactive session to gather the lessons learned.

Summary information about the project shall be collected and archived, based on organizationally defined procedures. Typical information that is archived includes:

- a description of the project,
- a project organization chart,
- budgeted and actual cost,
- budgeted and actual schedule, and
- the project close-out report.

Assumptions associated with the project values and changes that were documented throughout the project are also useful to archive.

6.5.3.2 Project Close-Out Requirements – It is the responsibility of the project manager to ensure that a project is properly closed out and that a PIER is completed and submitted to the appropriate entities for review and approval.

6.5.3.3 References to Project Close-Out Guidelines – Guidelines for project close-out are provided in the ITEC Project Management Methodology document in the Project Close-Out section.

6.5.4 Post-Implementation Evaluation Report – The PIER documents the history of a project and provides recommendations for other projects of similar size and scope. The PIER is to be completed on each project when cancelled or completed. A copy needs to be provided to the appropriate branch CITO within six months of project completion or cancellation.

6.5.4.1 **Sample PIER Outline:**

- Executive Summary
 - Discussion of key points of the project (maximum 1 page)
- Project Objectives
 - What were the objectives the project was to accomplish?
 - What was the business problem that needed to be solved?
 - Business Areas
 - Who were the project customers and a description of the business areas covered by the project
- Project Personnel and Organization
 - A listing of project personnel including their functional title
 - The project Organizational Chart
- Project History and Timeline
 - An overview of the major activities of the project and how they were accomplished.
 - Gantt Chart showing a high-level summary of the activities and timeline.
- Risk Assessment and Mitigation Techniques
 - What risks occurred and what techniques were used to mitigate these risks?
- Change Control, Quality and Configuration Management Techniques
 - What techniques were used to ensure change control, quality and configuration management and their effectiveness?
- Project Communication
 - What techniques were used to ensure communication and their effectiveness?

- Customer Expectations
 - How were customer expectations identified and met, and what were the techniques for handling them?
 - What were the success factors and how they were met?
- Project Results
 - Statistical/Financial Data
 - Planned versus actual final schedule data
 - Planned versus actual final project cost (should be broken down by internal and external cost for Planning, Execution and Close-Out)
- Lessons Learned
 - Key findings of the Lessons Learned including recommendations

7.0 RESPONSIBILITIES:

7.1 Heads of state agencies are responsible for establishing procedures for their organizations' compliance with the requirements of this standard.

7.2 The CITO, Executive Branch, is responsible for the maintenance of this policy.

8.0 CANCELLATION: All previous versions of this standard.

9.0 HISTORY: Standard was enacted in October 2000, revised October 2004, July 2010, April 2019, and July 2023.