Managing Outsourcing - A Practicum

Sukhjit Singh

De Anza College

Workforce

CC BY 4.0



Managing Outsourcing - A Practicum

This text is disseminated via the Open Education Resource (OER) LibreTexts Project (https://LibreTexts.org) and like the thousands of other texts available within this powerful platform, it is freely available for reading, printing, and "consuming."

The LibreTexts mission is to bring together students, faculty, and scholars in a collaborative effort to provide an accessible, and comprehensive platform that empowers our community to develop, curate, adapt, and adopt openly licensed resources and technologies; through these efforts we can reduce the financial burden borne from traditional educational resource costs, ensuring education is more accessible for students and communities worldwide.

Most, but not all, pages in the library have licenses that may allow individuals to make changes, save, and print this book. Carefully consult the applicable license(s) before pursuing such effects. Instructors can adopt existing LibreTexts texts or Remix them to quickly build course-specific resources to meet the needs of their students. Unlike traditional textbooks, LibreTexts' web based origins allow powerful integration of advanced features and new technologies to support learning.



LibreTexts is the adaptable, user-friendly non-profit open education resource platform that educators trust for creating, customizing, and sharing accessible, interactive textbooks, adaptive homework, and ancillary materials. We collaborate with individuals and organizations to champion open education initiatives, support institutional publishing programs, drive curriculum development projects, and more.

The LibreTexts libraries are Powered by NICE CXone Expert and were supported by the Department of Education Open Textbook Pilot Project, the California Education Learning Lab, the UC Davis Office of the Provost, the UC Davis Library, the California State University Affordable Learning Solutions Program, and Merlot. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 1246120, 1525057, and 1413739.

Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation nor the US Department of Education.

Have questions or comments? For information about adoptions or adaptions contact info@LibreTexts.org or visit our main website at https://LibreTexts.org.

The LibreTexts name, logo, and book covers are trademarked by LibreTexts, Inc. (a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organization) and protected against unauthorized use.

This text was compiled on 09/04/2026

Program Page



De Anza College sits in the heart of Silicon Valley, where innovation and opportunity are part of daily life, and also has one of the highest costs of living in the country. For our students, that makes every dollar count, and the price of a textbook can be the difference between staying enrolled or dropping a class. Our Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) program closes that gap by giving students full access to high-quality, faculty-created course materials at no cost from the first day of class.

De Anza is proud of its diverse student community, and we hold our ZTC materials to the same standard of excellence that defines the college. Faculty across departments write, adapt, and review these resources themselves, keeping them accurate, current, and grounded in the perspectives of the students who use them, with accessibility and inclusive design built in from the start.

This program reflects the time and care our faculty invest in their students. If you have questions, feedback, or come across any issues with a ZTC resource, contact De Anza College's ZTC Grants Coordinator, Shagun Kaur.

Learn more about De Anza ZTC Program [www.deanza.edu/academic-services/oer/]

Note: The De Anza logo is a copyrighted trademark of De Anza College and may not be reproduced without permission.

This page titled Program Page is shared under a Public Domain license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Program Page

Accessibility Statement

AI Use

About the Book

About the Author

Licensing

1: Foundations for Success- How to Navigate This Book

1.1: Preface

1.2: How to use this book?

1.3: Overview

1.4: Problem-Based Learning- A Pedagogical Approach That Lasts

1.5: Your role in this Practicum

1.6: Tools and Resources

1.7: Grading and Assessment Overview

1.8: Collaboration and Integrity

1.9: Problem-Based Learning Student Guide

1.10: Welcome to C-Bay Inc.

1.11: Forming Teams for the Practicum

1.12: Project Management Basics

2: Introduction to Outsourcing

2.1: Outsourcing – What It Means Today

2.1.1: Case Study- Walmart - The 100,000 T-Shirts

2.1.2: Case Study- Boeing and the Outsourcing Dilemma

2.2: The Procurement and Solicitation Process

2.2.1: Procurement and Solicitation – The Work Before the Work

2.2.2: Step 1 - Procurement Strategy – Laying the Groundwork

2.2.3: Step 2- Establish Requirements – Getting the Documentation Right

2.2.4: Step 3- Statement of Work (SOW) – Defining the Relationship

2.2.5: Step 4- Request for Proposal (RFP) – Finding the Right Fit

2.2.6: Step 5- Vendor Response Evaluation – More Than Numbers

2.2.7: Step 6- Contract Negotiation and Signing – Setting Legal Ground Rules

2.2.8: Step 7- Monitoring and Control – Staying in the Loop

2.2.9: Deliverables from the Procurement Process

2.2.10: Final Thoughts- The Project Manager's Role in Procurement

2.2.11: Step 8- Contract Management and Closure – Delivering and Wrapping Up

2.3: Case Study

2.3.1: Planning for Outsourcing
2.3.2: Initiation- Exploring Outsourcing Options for the Reckon Project
2.3.3: Plan of Attack- Making the Case for Smart Outsourcing
2.3.4: Planning for Outsourcing – Student Workbook
2.3.4.1: SWOT Analysis for Outsourcing Justification
2.3.4.2: Make-or-Buy Analysis
2.3.4.3: Contract Type Evaluation
2.3.4.4: Supplier Selection Plan
2.3.4.5: Risk Management Plan
2.3.4.6: Reflection Questions and Lessons Learned
2.3.4.7: Submission Checklist and Final Assembly
2.3.4.8: Reflection and Final Submission

3: Building the Procurement and Solicitation Plan
3.1: Outsourcing Brief
3.2: Plan of Attack (with Templates)
3.3: Learning Resources
3.4: Tips and Traps
3.5: FAQs
3.6: Grading Rubric – Chapter 3- Procurement and Solicitation Plan
3.7: Reflection and Analysis Questions
3.8: Submission Checklist

4: Managing the Supplier — Execution Under Fire
4.1: From Procurement to Execution
4.2: Project Execution in the Context of Managing a Vendor
4.3: Project Reckon - Enterprise Context
4.4: Managing a Fully Outsourced Product Development Initiative
4.5: Project Reckon — Applied Vendor Management Lab
4.5.1: Scenario 3 – Financial Strain and Emerging Scope Pressure
4.5.2: Scenario 4 – Change Order Request and Emerging Milestone Slip
4.5.3: Scenario 5 – Executive Pressure and Vendor Defensiveness
4.5.4: Scenario 6 – Formal Corrective Action and Performance Accountability
4.5.5: Scenario 7 – Vendor Pushback and Contract Alignment
4.5.6: Scenario 8 – Internal Escalation and Executive Scrutiny
4.5.7: Scenario 9 – Budget Threshold Breach and CFO Escalation
4.5.8: Scenario 10 – Release Candidate Go / No-Go Decision
4.5.9: Scenario 11 – Post-Release Feedback and Perceived Quality Gap
4.5.10: Scenario 12 – Stakeholder Pressure and Backlog Expansion Risk
4.5.11: Scenario 13 – Vendor Capacity Constraints and Resource Allocation Conflict
4.5.12: Scenario 14 – Resource Expansion and Quality Instability

4.5.13: Scenario 15 – Architecture Audit and Design Integrity Risk
4.5.14: Scenario 16 – Executive Mandate for Immediate Architectural Correction
4.5.15: Scenario 17 – Refactoring Impact and Regression Instability
4.5.16: Scenario 18 – Stakeholder Frustration and Loss of Confidence
4.5.17: Scenario 1 – Reporting Module Ambiguity
4.5.18: Scenario 19 – Stabilize, Rollback, or Continue Forward
4.5.19: Scenario 20 – Consequences of Stabilization Decision
4.5.20: Scenario 21 – Renewed Feature Pressure and Controlled Expansion
4.5.21: Scenario 22 – Overconfidence and Early Drift
4.5.22: Scenario 23 – Visible Scope Drift and Baseline Erosion
4.5.23: Scenario 24 – Scope Reconciliation and Stakeholder Conflict
4.5.24: Scenario 25 – Baseline Reset and Contract Realignment
4.5.25: Scenario 26 – Post-Realignment Execution Discipline Breakdown
4.5.26: Scenario 27 – Process Drift Reappears and Measurable Impact Emerges
4.5.27: Scenario 28 – Control Enforcement and Vendor Friction
4.5.28: Scenario 2 – Integration Instability and Defect Clustering
4.5.29: Scenario 29 – Final Delivery Pressure and Completion Readiness
4.5.30: Scenario 30 – Post-Delivery Review and Lessons Learned
4.5.31: Project Reckon Risk Register and Control Log

Index

Glossary

Detailed Licensing

Instructor Facilitation Guide

Bonus Material

Templates and Tools Library

Decision Frameworks

This page titled Managing Outsourcing - A Practicum is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit Singh.

Accessibility Statement

Accessibility

De Anza College is dedicated to creating learning materials that are accessible and benefit all students. Our materials follow the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 Level AA. Our authors and contracted accessibility specialists checked all resources using this ASCCC OERI checklist, the accessibility tool in LibreTexts, WAVE, JAWS, and other more detailed checks for complex materials such as interactive components.

We selected LibreTexts as our preferred platform because of its commitment to accessibility. In addition to the platform's inherent accessibility, we collaborated with the LibreTexts team to fix any accessibility issues we found.

Our Accessibility Review Process

Accessibility was built into the resource as it was written. This resource went through the following stages of review:

1. **Template check.** The project coordinator and instructional designers checked the first chapter for accessibility as a model to ensure later chapters meet accessibility standards.
2. **Progress checks.** The manuscript was checked at approximately 40%, 60%, and 80% completion to catch and correct accessibility issues in production.
3. **Specialist review.** Once the manuscript was complete, an accessibility expert conducted an accessibility check.
4. **Remediation.** The author and the project manager who conducted the earlier progress checks worked together to remediate the issues identified by the accessibility expert.
5. **Final check.** The resource underwent another full check by the accessibility expert before the book was deemed ready for publication.

This process combines ongoing checks during writing with a final specialist review, so issues are caught early and confirmed fixed before publication.

Report an Accessibility Problem

We are always looking for ways to make our resources more accessible. If you run into a barrier while using this resource, please let us know so we can look into it. When you contact us, it helps to include:

- The name of the resource
- The location of the problem (a web address or page/chapter description)
- A description of the problem you encountered
- The device, browser, and any assistive technology you were using (e.g., Windows 11, Google Chrome, JAWS screen reader)

Contact us: De Anza ZTC team

This statement was last updated August 2026

This resource was project-managed by **Shagun Kaur**, overseeing scope, budget, and schedule; stakeholder coordination via monthly meetings; training and platform support (LibreTexts, troubleshooting, technical support); QA/accessibility check scheduling; and licensing and copyright governance.

A Note on Known Limitations

No accessibility check is perfect. We've made a genuine, sustained effort to catch and fix issues throughout the writing and review process described above, but some barriers may remain, especially in complex or interactive content. We'd rather be upfront about that than claim a standard of perfection we can't guarantee.

This page titled Accessibility Statement is shared under a Public Domain license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

AI Use

All substantive content in Managing Outsourcing – A Practicum was developed by the human author based on professional experience, subject-matter expertise, original instructional materials, and teaching practice. Artificial intelligence tools were used under the author's direction as editing and instructional-production aids.

AI Tools Used

The primary AI tool used in the development of this book was ChatGPT by OpenAI.

How AI Was Used

AI assisted with editing and refining author-developed content; improving clarity, organization, consistency, and presentation; and supporting the formatting and refinement of instructional materials such as scenarios, student instructions, templates, examples, reflection questions, and assessment materials.

The author established the subject matter, instructional approach, learning objectives, project context, and pedagogical direction of the book.

Guardrails

AI use was limited to author-created materials, materials the author had permission to use, and appropriately licensed Open Educational Resources (OER). AI was not used to independently reproduce or substitute copyrighted textbook content.

All AI-assisted material was reviewed, revised as appropriate, and approved by the author before publication. AI output was not treated as an authoritative source or as a substitute for subject-matter expertise or professional judgment. The author retained full editorial control and responsibility for the accuracy, instructional design, and final content of the book.

This page titled AI Use is shared under a license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

About the Book

Every year, organizations invest billions of dollars in outsourcing software development, information technology services, business operations, customer support, manufacturing, logistics, and countless other functions. Some outsourcing initiatives produce tremendous value by accelerating innovation, reducing costs, and providing access to specialized expertise. Others fail spectacularly, resulting in missed deadlines, budget overruns, poor quality, legal disputes, damaged relationships, and dissatisfied customers.

The difference is rarely the technology.

The difference is almost always **how the outsourcing effort is planned, managed, governed, and executed.**

This book was written to teach those skills.

Unlike traditional outsourcing textbooks that focus primarily on theory, terminology, or procurement regulations, **Managing Outsourcing: A Practicum** places you directly into the role of a project manager responsible for leading a complex outsourcing initiative from its earliest planning stages through procurement, supplier selection, project execution, governance, performance management, and final project closure.

You are not simply reading about outsourcing.

You are **living it.**

Throughout this practicum, you will experience the same types of situations encountered by project managers, procurement specialists, vendor managers, executive sponsors, architects, quality managers, and business leaders responsible for outsourcing large projects. Every chapter builds upon previous work, requiring you to make decisions, justify recommendations, communicate with stakeholders, solve unexpected problems, and produce professional-quality documentation similar to that used in industry.

Rather than presenting isolated assignments, this book follows the complete lifecycle of a single outsourcing engagement. Each milestone represents another stage in the project's evolution. As the project grows, so do your responsibilities. Early chapters focus on strategic planning and procurement, while later chapters introduce supplier management, project execution, governance, performance monitoring, crisis management, executive communication, corrective action planning, and organizational leadership.

This progressive approach mirrors how projects evolve in professional environments. Project managers rarely receive all of the information they need at the beginning of a project. Instead, new information arrives continuously. Risks emerge unexpectedly. Requirements change. Stakeholders disagree. Vendors encounter obstacles. Schedules begin to slip. Budgets require adjustment. Leaders ask difficult questions. The project manager must continuously evaluate new information, communicate effectively, and make sound decisions under pressure.

That is exactly the environment this practicum has been designed to simulate.

A Problem-Based Learning Experience

This book is built around a **Problem-Based Learning (PBL)** philosophy.

Rather than memorizing definitions or completing isolated exercises, you will solve realistic business problems by applying project management principles, procurement methodologies, communication strategies, leadership techniques, and critical thinking skills.

Every milestone asks you to investigate a realistic business situation, evaluate available information, develop alternatives, justify your decisions, and communicate your recommendations professionally. There is often more than one acceptable solution. Success depends not only on reaching a conclusion, but also on demonstrating logical reasoning, sound judgment, and effective communication.

This reflects professional practice, where project managers are rarely given perfect information or obvious answers.

Learning Through Professional Practice

Throughout this practicum you will create many of the same documents produced by professional project teams.

Examples include:

- Project planning documentation
- Outsourcing strategies
- SWOT and Make-or-Buy analyses
- Procurement and Solicitation Plans
- Statements of Work (SOW)
- Requests for Proposal (RFP)
- Vendor evaluation scorecards
- Contract documentation
- Risk registers
- Change management documentation
- Executive communications
- Status reports
- Corrective action plans
- Governance documentation
- Vendor performance evaluations
- Project close-out reports

These deliverables are not academic exercises. They are based on industry practices used by organizations that manage complex outsourcing engagements.

By completing these artifacts, you will gain practical experience that extends beyond textbook knowledge and prepares you for professional environments.

Developing the Mindset of a Project Leader

Technical knowledge alone does not make an effective project manager.

Successful outsourcing requires the ability to:

- Think strategically while acting operationally.
- Balance competing priorities.
- Communicate with technical and non-technical audiences.
- Negotiate competing stakeholder interests.
- Interpret project performance metrics.

- Manage uncertainty.
- Build productive vendor relationships.
- Make difficult decisions under pressure.
- Lead teams through ambiguity and change.

These leadership skills are intentionally embedded throughout every milestone.

As the practicum progresses, the scenarios become increasingly realistic and challenging. Rather than simply documenting plans, you will learn to respond to changing circumstances, defend your recommendations, and guide projects through difficult situations while maintaining professionalism and organizational trust.

The Reckon Project

To provide continuity across the practicum, this book follows the development of **Project Reckon**, a realistic outsourced software development initiative.

Rather than studying unrelated case studies in each chapter, you will participate in a continuous project narrative. The decisions you make during early milestones influence the situations you encounter later. Procurement decisions affect supplier performance. Contract choices influence governance. Communication practices shape stakeholder confidence. Risk management decisions affect project recovery.

This continuous storyline allows you to experience outsourcing as an integrated management discipline rather than a collection of unrelated concepts.

Thinking Beyond the Classroom

While this practicum has been designed for classroom instruction, its ultimate purpose is much broader.

Organizations increasingly rely on project managers who can integrate business strategy, procurement, vendor management, communication, leadership, governance, and technical understanding into a cohesive management approach.

The tools presented in this book are intended to help you develop those capabilities.

Whether you pursue careers in project management, information technology, consulting, operations, procurement, engineering, healthcare, government, manufacturing, finance, or entrepreneurship, the principles explored throughout this practicum will help you manage complex initiatives involving multiple stakeholders, external suppliers, competing priorities, and uncertain environments.

Our Goal

Our goal is simple.

By the time you complete this practicum, you should not simply understand what outsourcing is.

You should understand **how to lead an outsourcing initiative successfully**.

You should be able to evaluate strategic decisions, design procurement processes, select qualified suppliers, negotiate effective contracts, manage vendor performance, communicate with executives, respond to project challenges, and guide outsourced projects from concept to successful completion.

Most importantly, you should leave this experience thinking not like a student completing assignments, but like a project manager responsible for delivering value through disciplined planning, effective leadership, and continuous execution.

Because ultimately, successful outsourcing is not about transferring work to someone else.

It is about **leading people, managing relationships, and delivering results.**

This page titled About the Book is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

About the Author

This page titled About the Author is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

Licensing

A detailed breakdown of this resource's licensing can be found in ***Back Matter/Detailed Licensing***.

This page titled Licensing is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

1: FOUNDATIONS FOR SUCCESS- HOW TO NAVIGATE THIS BOOK

1.1: Preface

1.2: How to use this book?

1.3: Overview

1.4: Problem-Based Learning- A Pedagogical Approach That Lasts

1.5: Your role in this Practicum

1.6: Tools and Resources

1.7: Grading and Assessment Overview

1.8: Collaboration and Integrity

1.9: Problem-Based Learning Student Guide

1.10: Welcome to C-Bay Inc.

1.11: Forming Teams for the Practicum

1.12: Project Management Basics

This page titled 1: Foundations for Success- How to Navigate This Book is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

1.1: Preface

Welcome to the Practicum: Your Journey into the Real World of Outsourcing

Dear Reader,

Welcome to *Managing Outsourcing – A Practicum*. If you're expecting a traditional textbook filled with long lectures and abstract theory, let me gently reset that expectation: this is something entirely different.

This is a practicum. That means you're not here to simply read—you're here to *do*.

In today's interconnected world, outsourcing is more than a cost-saving strategy. It's a leadership function. A strategic capability. A make-or-break decision that can determine whether a project soars or sinks. That's why this course, and this book, are built to give you experience—not just information.

You'll take on the role of someone leading outsourcing decisions inside an organization. At times you'll act as the **project manager**, **procurement lead**, **technical sponsor**, or **relationship manager**. You'll be asked to assess when and what to outsource, write RFPs, evaluate vendors, negotiate contracts, and manage relationships when things go wrong (and they will). You will not be watching outsourcing happen from the sidelines—you'll be in the middle of it.

To help you succeed in this role, this book is built on the principles of **Problem-Based Learning (PBL)**.

Why Problem-Based Learning?

Problem-Based Learning flips the script on education. Instead of starting with a lecture and ending with a quiz, we begin with a problem—one you're expected to solve. You'll learn through decision-making, not note-taking. Through action, not abstraction. Each milestone starts with a real-world scenario, and from there, you'll be given tools, resources, and guidance to analyze, plan, respond, and reflect.

You'll hit roadblocks. You'll encounter ambiguity. You'll have to think on your feet. That's by design. Because in real outsourcing work, there is rarely one right answer. What matters is *how* you think—how you communicate, justify, and improve your decisions.

This method will stretch you, but it will also prepare you. Graduates of this course have stepped into tech companies, nonprofits, healthcare systems, and startups with the confidence to lead cross-functional teams, write professional-grade RFPs, and manage vendors with clarity and professionalism. You can too.

What This Textbook Will Give You

This is not a passive resource. It's a toolkit.

Each chapter—framed as a **milestone**—includes:

- **A real-world story scenario** to immerse you in a meaningful role
- **A "Plan of Attack"** to guide your thinking and strategy
- **Learning resources** to help you build skills at the right time
- **Tips and traps** drawn from industry experience
- **Templates and tools** (RFPs, evaluation grids, checklists)
- **FAQs** to answer common "what if..." moments
- **Quizzes and tests** for quick self-checks
- **Grading rubrics** to understand how your work will be assessed
- **Reflection and analysis prompts** to help you improve

Each milestone builds on the last, just like in the real world. You're not just completing tasks—you're growing into your role.

What I Ask of You

- **Be curious.** When you face a challenge, lean into it. There is gold in confusion—if you stay engaged.
- **Be reflective.** This isn't just about getting it "right." It's about noticing how you grow in confidence, clarity, and judgment.
- **Be collaborative.** If you're working in a team or discussing in forums, remember: outsourcing is a team sport. So is learning.
- **Be professional.** Treat your submissions and interactions as if you were on the job. Because one day soon, you will be.

Your Role Starts Now

By the time you finish this course, you'll have more than knowledge. You'll have a portfolio of work, a series of completed outsourcing milestones, and a working confidence in your ability to lead real projects.

You'll have practiced *doing the work*—not just studying the theory behind it.

So take a deep breath. You're about to begin a journey into the complex, high-stakes, deeply human world of managing outsourced projects. And I'll be with you the whole way.

Let's get to work.

This page titled 1.1: Preface is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

1.2: How to use this book?

A Practicum Guide to Learning by Doing

What This Book Is

This book is your field manual. It's designed to **simulate the real experience of managing outsourcing** in fast-moving, high-stakes environments. You'll engage with realistic scenarios, perform the actual tasks required in industry, and reflect on what works and what doesn't.

Instead of passively reading through theory, you'll **step into the shoes of an outsourcing lead** and complete project-based deliverables for each milestone—like building a procurement plan, writing an RFP, evaluating bids, or managing a problematic vendor.

This is **not** a linear textbook where you read Chapter 1, memorize terms, and move on. This is a **problem-driven, role-based practicum** where each milestone builds practical knowledge by putting you in the middle of the work.

Book Structure Overview

The book is divided into **five major milestones**, each representing a phase in the outsourcing lifecycle:

1. **Planning for Outsourcing**
2. **Preparing for Outsourcing**
3. **Selecting the Vendor**
4. **Managing the Outsourced Relationship**
5. **Closing the Contract and Lessons Learned**

Each milestone contains the following instructional components:

Story Scenario

A realistic, immersive case that positions *you* in a professional role. This is the anchor of each milestone and serves as the "problem" you must solve.

Plan of Attack

A high-level roadmap that outlines how to approach the milestone. It breaks the challenge into manageable steps, often with decision-making forks along the way.

Learning Resources

Short, focused readings, tutorials, diagrams, and examples that provide the technical and strategic knowledge you'll need to complete the task.

Tips and Traps

A collection of insights based on common mistakes students or professionals make. Think of this as "what your future mentor wishes you knew."

Templates and Tools

Downloadable RFP templates, evaluation grids, communication samples, checklists, and more. These help you get started without reinventing the wheel.

FAQs

Quick guidance on issues you're likely to face, such as:

"What if I don't have enough information to make a decision?"

"Can I change my outsourcing scope midway?"

Quizzes and Tests

Low-stakes knowledge checks or scenario-based questions. These can be used for self-assessment, homework, or class discussion.

Grading Rubrics

A clear description of how your work will be evaluated. This includes criteria such as clarity, accuracy, realism, and application of PBL principles.

Analytical & Comprehensive Questions

Open-ended reflection prompts to deepen your learning and improve decision-making judgment. Ideal for class discussion or journaling.

How to Approach Each Milestone

Think of each milestone as a mini-project with these steps:

1. **Read the Story Scenario.**
   - Imagine you're actually in that role—what would you do?
2. **Review the Plan of Attack.**
   - Understand your objective and the path to get there.
3. **Skim the Learning Resources.**
   - Use these to plug knowledge gaps *just in time*—not all at once.
4. **Explore Tips and Traps.**
   - Learn from the mistakes of others before making your own.
5. **Download the Templates.**
   - Use them as starting points for your deliverables.
6. **Work the Problem.**
   - Use class time, team meetings, or solo sessions to build your milestone deliverable.
7. **Test Yourself.**
   - Use the quizzes and scenario questions to check understanding.
8. **Reflect and Revise.**
   - Use the analysis questions to step back and evaluate what worked, what didn't, and what you'd do differently.
9. **Submit and Review Feedback.**
   - Use rubrics and instructor or peer feedback to improve iteratively.

Individual vs. Team Work

- Some milestones may be done individually; others are team-based.

- Clear instructions are provided at the start of each milestone.
- For team milestones, collaboration and communication are part of your grade—just like in real life.

Key Principles to Keep in Mind

- **You are not a student here. You are a professional-in-training.**
- **There is no "right" answer—only reasoned decisions.**
- **Struggle is part of the process. Learn from it.**
- **Be willing to adapt. Outsourcing is as much about judgment as it is about planning.**
- **Reflection is as valuable as execution.**

Where to Begin

Before diving into Milestone 1, be sure to:

- Read the **Preface** to understand the course philosophy.
- Bookmark or download the **Templates & Tools Directory**.
- Review the **Course Overview** and SLOs (Student Learning Outcomes).
- Familiarize yourself with **how rubrics and deliverables will be graded**.

Final Note

You don't learn outsourcing by watching someone else do it. You learn by planning, acting, adjusting, and reflecting. This book will guide you through that process. Use it actively, collaboratively, and professionally.

This is your training ground. Let's build your confidence—and your capabilities—one milestone at a time.

This page titled 1.2: How to use this book? is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

1.3: Overview

Managing Outsourcing – A Practicum

What This Is About

Outsourcing is no longer just a tactical decision—it's a strategic imperative. Whether an organization needs to scale a product quickly, access specialized talent, manage costs, or improve efficiency, the ability to engage external partners effectively can determine success or failure. But outsourcing well requires far more than just signing a contract. It demands clarity, planning, negotiation, accountability, and trust.

This resource guides you through the full journey of managing outsourcing using a hands-on, problem-solving approach. Rather than reading passively about procurement theories, you'll step into realistic business scenarios, assume professional roles, and respond to evolving challenges. Each task you complete mirrors the kinds of decisions outsourcing leaders face every day—from writing RFPs and evaluating proposals to handling vendor breakdowns and closing out contracts. This approach centers on doing the work, not just learning about it—so you emerge not only informed but experienced.

What's Covered (The Full Outsourcing Lifecycle)

The learning experience is structured around five interconnected milestones, each representing a core phase in the outsourcing process. These milestones simulate the arc of a real-world project, with each chapter placing you inside a new decision point as a leader navigating external partnerships.

In **Milestone 1: Planning for Outsourcing**, you begin by assessing whether outsourcing is even the right solution. You'll examine a business case where internal capacity has hit its limit, and it's up to you to decide what can or should be outsourced. You'll learn how to conduct a make-or-buy analysis, evaluate risks, clarify scope boundaries, and outline a procurement management plan that aligns with organizational goals.

Milestone 2: Preparing for Outsourcing focuses on communication and structure. Once the decision to outsource has been made, you'll shift into the preparatory work that enables a strong vendor engagement. Here, you'll craft a detailed Statement of Work (SOW), build a Request for Proposal (RFP), and develop solicitation plans that identify and attract qualified vendors. You'll also define the criteria by which proposals will be evaluated, setting the stage for a competitive and transparent selection process.

In **Milestone 3: Selecting the Vendor**, the pressure rises. You'll receive proposals in response to your RFP and must now apply structured, fair, and defensible methods for choosing the right partner. You'll evaluate bids using weighted matrices, conduct bidder meetings or interviews, and balance technical, financial, and relational factors. This milestone teaches you how to select a vendor with confidence while documenting and justifying your decisions for internal stakeholders.

Milestone 4: Managing the Outsourced Relationship immerses you in the reality of vendor oversight. This is where plans are tested by real-world complications—missed deadlines, scope creep, cultural misunderstandings, or unclear expectations. You'll learn to monitor performance using KPIs and SLAs, manage communication rhythms, apply change control processes, and resolve issues professionally while maintaining alignment with your internal team.

Finally, **Milestone 5: Closing the Contract and Learning from It** brings the project to its conclusion. You'll conduct formal acceptance, ensure deliverables are met, settle outstanding payments, and close out documentation. But this milestone isn't just about completion—it's about reflection. You'll review vendor performance, identify what worked and what didn't, and capture insights that can improve future outsourcing initiatives.

What You'll Be Able to Do

By the time you complete the full set of milestones, you'll have the skills and experience to manage outsourcing initiatives from start to finish. You'll be able to define outsourcing needs, design and distribute professional-grade RFPs, select vendors using structured evaluation tools, manage complex third-party relationships, and lead closure with integrity and documentation. This

experience-based learning process ensures that you don't just know how outsourcing works—you've practiced how to make it work.

What You'll Create

Throughout the process, you'll build a series of deliverables that mirror what real professionals are expected to produce on the job. These include a complete Procurement Management Plan, a fully developed Request for Proposal, a detailed Statement of Work, vendor evaluation tools, performance reviews, and lessons learned documents. Each output is connected to a milestone scenario, giving you an opportunity to create something useful, relevant, and portfolio-worthy.

How It Works

This experience is built on a Problem-Based Learning (PBL) model. That means you'll be learning by solving authentic problems in realistic situations. You'll begin each milestone with a story—a scenario that places you in a professional role facing a challenge that must be resolved. Rather than reading chapters of theoretical content and then answering questions at the end, you'll dive straight into the problem and receive guidance, tools, and resources along the way as you need them. This mirrors how real-world work happens: people don't study outsourcing in the abstract; they respond to deadlines, scope shifts, and unexpected complications with action, iteration, and strategic thinking.

You'll be guided through each milestone with a structured learning flow that includes a scenario, plan of attack, learning resources, tips and traps, reflection prompts, tools and templates, and assessments. This framework supports both independent and collaborative learning, allowing for flexibility while building discipline and confidence.

Why This Matters

Outsourcing is everywhere—from Silicon Valley startups to nonprofit organizations to Fortune 500 companies. Those who can navigate the outsourcing lifecycle with skill and confidence are in high demand across industries. This experience equips you with more than knowledge—it gives you the ability to *lead*. You'll leave with a clearer understanding of outsourcing and a tangible record of your ability to manage it in action.

This page titled 1.3: Overview is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

1.4: Problem-Based Learning- A Pedagogical Approach That Lasts

A Pedagogical Approach That Lasts

In today's fast-moving world, where work is increasingly complex, ambiguous, and team-based, education must evolve beyond rote memorization and passive content delivery. Knowledge alone is no longer the differentiator—**the ability to apply knowledge in uncertain, high-stakes situations is**. That is why this learning experience is grounded in a deep, intentional application of **Problem-Based Learning (PBL)**—a pedagogy rooted in realism, reflection, and responsibility.

Problem-Based Learning begins not with the transmission of theory, but with the **presentation of a real-world challenge**. In this environment, we call it an **Outsourcing Brief**. This brief does not describe a hypothetical situation for contemplation—it simulates a credible business problem for action. You are not asked to speculate about outsourcing from the safety of abstraction. Instead, you are cast into the role of someone with real accountability—tasked with making decisions, producing deliverables, managing uncertainty, and justifying outcomes. You become the project lead, the procurement officer, the vendor manager. In this way, PBL **transforms learners from passive recipients into active professionals-in-training**.

A Tale of Two Learners

Consider two learners, both preparing for roles in IT project management. One sits through a semester of lectures on vendor contracts and procurement methods. They learn the terminology, memorize the steps of the procurement lifecycle, and pass the final exam with a respectable grade.

The other begins with a problem: her company has just lost two developers mid-project, and she's been tapped to quickly outsource a portion of the mobile app build without derailing the launch date. She is handed an Outsourcing Brief, a messy mix of email threads, stakeholder notes, shifting specs, and a looming deadline. There's no step-by-step guidance—just a clear expectation: "We need a vendor on contract within two weeks. Make it happen."

She scrambles. She drafts a scope of work, then rewrites it after realizing she missed key constraints. She evaluates proposals with incomplete data and defends her selection in front of a simulated executive panel. She makes mistakes—big ones—but she also learns. She reflects. She adapts. And she never forgets the feeling of presenting a vendor plan she finally believes in.

A year later, both learners apply for a real project manager position. When asked in an interview, "Tell me how you would manage vendor selection under a tight timeline," one recites the theory. The other recalls the chaos, the pressure, and the moment she found clarity. One knows the answer. The other has *lived* it.

That's the difference Problem-Based Learning makes.

Beyond Memorization—Toward Mastery

The learning process in PBL is not linear. You are not told what to do step-by-step. Instead, you are immersed in a realistic professional moment that **requires judgment, collaboration, prioritization, and iteration**. Support comes not in the form of traditional lectures, but through just-in-time tools, curated learning resources, reflective prompts, and the freedom to make (and correct) mistakes. This aligns with how real work is experienced: rarely as a clean path, but often as a series of imperfect decisions made under pressure with limited data.

Problem-Based Learning endures because it is **goal-based**, **role-based**, and **activity-driven**. It ties directly to the learner's future professional context. When students engage in tasks they are likely to face after graduation—writing RFPs, scoring vendor bids, handling mid-project conflicts—they build not just technical fluency, but confidence. These experiences stick not because they were rehearsed, but because they were lived. Research shows that the cognitive architecture of memory favors emotionally and personally engaging learning experiences. When a student feels the responsibility of delivering a clear scope of work to a fictional CEO, the lesson becomes visceral. **That kind of learning doesn't fade—it accumulates.**

A Curriculum That Mirrors Reality

PBL also cultivates the kind of "soft skills" that are increasingly prized in the modern workforce but rarely taught explicitly: decision-making under ambiguity, communication across roles, ethical reasoning, adaptability, and team alignment. These skills are developed not by reading about them, but by living them inside complex, often frustrating, problem environments. In this way, PBL acts as **a safe rehearsal space for the professional world**. Students not only learn how to complete tasks—they learn how to respond to pressure, rethink assumptions, and carry work to completion.

There is another reason why this pedagogical approach matters: it is **integrative**. It mirrors the real world, where projects are not neatly siloed into "legal," "finance," "communication," or "technical" tasks. In outsourcing, for example, one decision about contract scope impacts timelines, team capacity, and legal exposure. PBL ensures that learners see those connections and develop systems thinking—not just procedural compliance.

Practice, Not Just Theory

This practicum has been intentionally designed to reflect the principles of PBL throughout. Each milestone begins with an **Outsourcing Brief**—an unfolding situation that draws from industry practices and complex realities. Rather than being given instructions upfront, learners are challenged to act. They use tools as needed, reflect on trade-offs, revise deliverables, and receive feedback based on rubrics that measure both process and product. **The path is scaffolded, but never scripted.** Learning happens in the doing, not just in the reading.

Education That Stays With You

In a world where knowledge is easy to access but hard to apply well, **Problem-Based Learning offers something more than comprehension—it offers transformation**. It builds durable skills. It fosters identity. It prepares learners not just to perform, but to lead. And it gives them a story—not one they've been told, but one they've lived through.

That's why Problem-Based Learning lasts.

The PBL Advantage: At a Glance

A quick guide to why Problem-Based Learning works—and lasts.

Core elements of the Problem-Based Learning (PBL) model, showing how authentic project work, iterative feedback, role immersion, and structured reflection develop professional skills, judgment, and workplace readiness.

PBL Element	What It Looks Like in Practice	Why It Matters
Outsourcing Brief	Learners receive a real-world challenge tied to a professional role	Anchors learning in authentic, job-relevant tasks
Act First, Learn Along the Way	No upfront lectures—learners attempt the task, then pull in resources as needed	Mirrors how professionals solve problems; builds self-directed learning skills
Iteration Over Perfection	Students revise their work based on feedback, changing conditions, and reflection	Encourages resilience, adaptive thinking, and deeper learning

PBL Element	What It Looks Like in Practice	Why It Matters
Role-Based Immersion	Learners act as project leads, procurement officers, or vendor managers in evolving situations	Builds identity, accountability, and transferable workplace skills
Integrated Skill Development	Tasks blend communication, analysis, planning, ethics, and decision-making	Reflects real-world complexity—teaches learners how skills interact
Just-in-Time Support	Guidance, tools, and templates are provided only when learners encounter specific challenges	Encourages independence and critical thinking
Reflection & Debrief	Learners reflect on what worked, what didn't, and how they would improve in the future	Develops metacognition and professional judgment
Portfolio-Ready Outputs	Each milestone results in tangible artifacts (RFPs, matrices, vendor assessments, etc.)	Builds confidence and creates real evidence of learning and readiness
Emotionally Engaging Challenges	Simulated stressors like deadlines, ambiguity, and competing priorities drive the learning process	Boosts retention and creates long-term memory through meaningful struggle
Practice Before Performance	Safe space to fail, try again, and ultimately succeed	Builds capability—not just competence

This page titled 1.4: Problem-Based Learning- A Pedagogical Approach That Lasts is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

1.5: Your role in this Practicum

More Than a Student—A Professional-in-Training

In this practicum, you are not simply a student enrolled in a course. You are a decision-maker, a strategist, a communicator, and a leader in training. From the very first milestone, your job is to step into **real-world roles** and perform tasks with **real consequences**, even if they unfold in a simulated space. This section outlines what that means and what is expected of you—not as a passive recipient of content, but as an active contributor to professional outcomes.

You Are the Outsourcing Lead

Each milestone begins with an **Outsourcing Brief** that places you inside a live, evolving project environment. Your organization needs to outsource a product, service, or capability, and you've been assigned responsibility for leading that process. Your role may shift throughout the experience—from procurement planner to vendor evaluator to contract manager—but at every phase, you are the one others are counting on to make thoughtful, defensible decisions.

You are expected to act as if you've been entrusted with real budget, timelines, and stakeholder expectations. You will review ambiguous inputs, analyze constraints, choose a path forward, and produce deliverables that would hold up in a professional context. The templates provided to you—SOWs, RFPs, evaluation matrices, performance reviews—are not just classroom exercises. They are **industry-standard tools**, and you are expected to complete them with the same care, clarity, and integrity you would bring to the workplace.

You Are a Self-Directed Problem Solver

In this learning model, you are not waiting to be taught. You are learning through **doing**. That means you must take initiative, wrestle with uncertainty, and make use of the support systems provided—just as a professional would.

You won't always be told exactly what to do. In fact, part of your growth will come from **defining the problem**, not just solving it. You'll need to assess the situation, ask the right questions, prioritize competing demands, and use the tools and resources strategically. Guidance will be available—through rubrics, prompts, office hours, and curated content—but **you are expected to lead your own learning process**.

You Are a Collaborator and Communicator

Many of your outsourcing decisions will affect or depend on others. That's intentional. Real-world outsourcing involves cross-functional teamwork, negotiation, and trust-building with stakeholders and vendors. Throughout this practicum, you'll work individually on some tasks and collaboratively on others. In both cases, your communication will be evaluated not only for correctness, but for clarity, tone, and professionalism.

When you engage with teammates, peers, or instructors, act with the same level of preparation and presence you would bring to a client meeting or executive briefing. Write clearly. Speak respectfully. Ask for feedback, and offer it constructively. You are not just building skills—you are **practicing your professional voice**.

You Are a Reflective Practitioner

This practicum isn't just about doing the work—it's about **learning from how you did the work**. After each milestone, you will be prompted to pause, review your process, and reflect. What did you miss at first? What decision was hardest to make—and why? What would you do differently next time?

This kind of metacognitive reflection is a core part of your role here. Professionals are not just judged by their output; they are valued for their ability to grow, self-correct, and improve over time. These reflective exercises help you develop that mindset—turning each task into an opportunity for deeper mastery.

You Are Accountable for Results

You will be evaluated based on your **professional judgment**, **document quality**, **use of tools**, and **ability to reflect and adapt**. The rubrics are designed to reward not just accuracy, but clarity, rigor, and responsiveness to context. This means you are responsible not only for what you submit, but for how you got there.

Late work, vague writing, incomplete templates, or decisions made without explanation will limit your success—not because they're "wrong," but because they don't meet the standards of someone ready to lead real outsourcing work. Think of this practicum not as an academic test, but as a **series of professional rehearsals**. Treat each one like it matters—because it does.

You Are Becoming a Practitioner

By the end of this experience, you won't just have completed assignments—you'll have **performed in a role**, **produced a portfolio of work**, and **sharpened your ability to lead** in real-world outsourcing contexts. You'll leave with more than a grade. You'll leave with practiced confidence, ready to contribute in a workplace where initiative, clarity, and applied thinking are what set professionals apart.

This page titled 1.5: Your role in this Practicum is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

1.6: Tools and Resources

Everything You Need to Manage Outsourcing Like a Pro

In this practicum, you won't be learning in isolation or from theory alone. To support your journey from learner to leader, you'll be equipped with a curated set of tools, templates, and resources that mirror what professionals use to manage real-world outsourcing initiatives. These materials are designed to help you work smarter, not harder—to focus on decision-making, not document formatting.

These are not just "attachments" or academic supplements. They are **your toolkit**—resources that you'll draw on repeatedly as you take on each Outsourcing Brief and complete milestone deliverables. You'll be encouraged to adapt, improve, and personalize them as your understanding deepens.

Templates and Forms

These structured documents will help you produce high-quality deliverables without starting from scratch. Every template is aligned with the milestone it supports and includes guidance, prompts, and examples to help you focus on content and strategy rather than formatting.

You'll have access to:

- **Procurement Management Plan Template** – to scope your outsourcing strategy and rationale
- **Make-or-Buy Analysis Worksheet** – to evaluate what should be outsourced
- **Statement of Work (SOW) Template** – to define clear, contract-ready expectations
- **Request for Proposal (RFP) Template** – to invite, inform, and structure vendor responses
- **Bid Evaluation Matrix** – to objectively compare proposals using weighted criteria
- **Vendor Performance Scorecard** – to assess delivery quality and relationship health
- **Lessons Learned Debrief Template** – to reflect on process improvements for future projects

Tools for Decision-Making

Beyond templates, you'll be using practical tools that simulate industry workflows and sharpen your analytical thinking. These include:

- **Weighted Scoring Models** – for prioritizing vendors or evaluating competing proposals
- **Risk Assessment Grids** – to identify and plan for possible outsourcing risks
- **Communication Logs** – to track vendor conversations, issues, and escalations
- **Gantt Charts or Timelines** – to visualize project delivery phases and vendor milestones

All tools are editable, customizable, and designed for real use—not academic exercises.

Curated Learning Resources

Because Problem-Based Learning is built on *learning through doing*, you'll be introduced to content **as you need it**, not before. Each milestone includes just-in-time learning resources such as:

- Short readings and concept primers (e.g., contract types, vendor governance models)
- Quick-reference job aids (e.g., "10 Clauses Every Outsourcing Contract Should Include")
- Sample documents and annotated examples
- Mini-guides to stakeholder communication, vendor negotiation, and scope management
- Open-access video tutorials and tool walk-throughs

These resources are designed to be fast, focused, and applicable—no heavy textbooks, no abstract lectures. The point is to give

you what you need, **when** you need it, to complete the task at hand.

Support Systems

You're not expected to work alone. Support is built into the experience, including:

- **Instructor or mentor feedback** based on clear rubrics
- **Office hours and discussion forums** for asking questions, brainstorming, or troubleshooting
- **Peer collaboration opportunities** for reviewing each other's SOWs, evaluation matrices, or final reports
- **Reflection prompts and checklists** to guide self-review before submitting deliverables

Real-World Relevance

All tools and templates in this practicum are modeled after real documents used in the field of IT, business operations, and procurement. Many are simplified versions of tools used by Fortune 500 companies, government agencies, and international development organizations. You'll be able to:

- Customize them for use in future internships, jobs, or capstone projects
- Include them in a **portfolio** of professional work
- Refer back to them anytime you encounter outsourcing decisions in your career

This toolkit will not only help you succeed in this practicum—it will stay with you far beyond it.

Because outsourcing doesn't just live in theory—it lives in **templates, tools, timelines, and trade-offs**. And now you'll have all of them at your fingertips.

This page titled 1.6: Tools and Resources is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

1.7: Grading and Assessment Overview

How We Evaluate Progress in a Problem-Based Practicum

In a traditional classroom, assessment often means checking for correct answers on a quiz or grading a paper against abstract standards. But in a problem-based, role-driven practicum like this one, grading takes on a different—and more meaningful—form. Here, assessment is not just about correctness. It's about **clarity of thought, professionalism of execution, depth of reflection, and the ability to improve over time**.

This learning environment places you in authentic roles where you must solve real problems, communicate your thinking, and produce work that resembles what professionals create in the field. That means assessment needs to reflect both outcomes and process—**how well you analyze, adapt, and grow across the full journey.**

How Rubrics Work

Every milestone deliverable is assessed using a structured rubric designed to evaluate your performance along multiple dimensions, including:

- **Alignment with the Brief**: Did your response directly address the expectations in the Outsourcing Brief?
- **Decision-Making Quality**: Did your work reflect thoughtful analysis, weighing of alternatives, and awareness of trade-offs?
- **Use of Tools**: Did you apply the right templates and frameworks effectively and appropriately?
- **Clarity and Professionalism**: Is your writing clear, persuasive, and formatted for real-world readability?
- **Growth Over Time**: Have you demonstrated improvement or reflection compared to earlier submissions?

Rubrics are shared with you in advance so you understand exactly what's being evaluated—and what excellence looks like. Importantly, the grading scale is designed **not to penalize early mistakes**, but to reward authentic effort, revision, and increasing mastery.

The Role of Feedback (Instructor, Peer, and Self)

In a learning environment built on real-world simulation, feedback is not an add-on—it is the **engine of progress**.

Instructor Feedback provides clear, experience-informed critique. Rather than telling you what's "right" or "wrong," feedback will highlight strengths, ask reflective questions, and encourage you to rethink key decisions—just as a manager or mentor might in the workplace.

Peer Feedback plays a key role in building collaborative skills. You will review the work of your peers using the same rubrics and professional standards applied to your own work. This process deepens your understanding, exposes you to alternative approaches, and builds evaluative thinking.

Self-Reflection is a required part of every milestone. You'll complete a short reflection analyzing what went well, what was difficult, and what you would do differently next time. This habit not only builds insight—it reinforces accountability and helps make learning stick.

Together, these three feedback sources create a **loop of continuous improvement**—just like in the real world, where feedback comes from many directions and your growth depends on how well you integrate it.

How Milestone Tasks and Reflections Contribute to Your Grade

The learning experience is structured around **five major milestones**. Each milestone includes one or more professional deliverables (e.g., a Procurement Management Plan, an RFP, or a Vendor Evaluation Matrix) and a reflective component.

Final grades are calculated using a **cumulative and holistic model**:

Milestone Deliverables (xx%)
Each major assignment is weighted by complexity. Early milestones are worth slightly less to allow room for learning through trial and error. Rubrics assess clarity, completeness, logic, and use of tools.

Reflection and Growth Journals (xx%)
These entries are assessed for thoughtfulness, insight, and your ability to connect feedback to future decisions.

Collaboration and Peer Feedback (xx%)
This includes meaningful engagement in team discussions, peer reviews, and shared decision-making processes. Quantity matters less than **quality of contribution**.

Professional Conduct and Submission Quality (xx%)
This measures timely submissions, consistent formatting, clear communication, and responsiveness to feedback.

This structure rewards **engaged learners who show up, try things, learn from mistakes, and continue improving**.

Why This Approach Works

This grading model is designed not to test how well you memorize outsourcing terms—but to evaluate how well you can **perform in a professional role**. It encourages creativity, responsibility, growth, and collaboration.

When you're assessed for how you solve problems, communicate solutions, and evolve your thinking, learning becomes more than a class. It becomes preparation for leadership, management, and impact in the real world.

Grading at a Glance

How your performance is assessed in the practicum

Grading components, weighting categories, and performance expectations used to evaluate project deliverables, professional growth, collaboration, and workplace readiness throughout the practicum.

Component	Weight	Focus
Milestone Deliverables	xx%	Real-world outsourcing tasks (e.g., RFPs, SOWs, vendor matrices) assessed via rubrics
Reflection & Growth Journals	xx%	Insightful analysis of your own decisions, challenges, and evolution as a practitioner
Peer Collaboration & Feedback	xx%	Contribution to team-based work, peer reviews, and shared learning
Professional Conduct & Submission Quality	xx%	Timeliness, formatting, naming conventions, and responsiveness to feedback

Rubric Focus Areas

Key criteria used to evaluate milestone submissions, including problem alignment, decision quality, effective use of project management tools, professional communication, and continuous improvement through feedback.

Category	What We Look For
Alignment with the Brief	Did you solve the right problem in the right way?
Decision-Making Quality	Did your work reflect thoughtful trade-offs, logic, and prioritization?
Use of Tools & Templates	Did you apply the correct frameworks to structure your thinking and documents?
Clarity & Professionalism	Was your work presented clearly, concisely, and in a professional tone and format?
Growth Over Time	Did you improve based on feedback and reflect meaningfully on your process?

Feedback Loop

- **Self** → Guided reflection after each milestone
- **Peer** → Structured reviews and team collaboration
- **Instructor** → Personalized, actionable critique to elevate your practice

The Goal

This isn't about perfection.
It's about progress.
You're not just being graded—you're being coached to lead.

This page titled 1.7: Grading and Assessment Overview is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

1.8: Collaboration and Integrity

Working Together, Thinking Critically, Acting Ethically

This practicum is not just about developing technical outsourcing skills—it's about practicing the behaviors that make outsourcing work in real life. At the heart of that is **collaboration and integrity**. These are not just course expectations; they are professional standards that will follow you throughout your career.

Whether you're writing a Statement of Work, evaluating vendors, or managing issues with a supplier, your ability to **work responsibly with others and make ethical decisions under pressure** is what ultimately builds trust and credibility in the field.

Expectations for Group Work vs. Individual Contributions

In this practicum, you'll engage in a combination of **individual and collaborative tasks**, just like in real-world outsourcing projects. Each milestone will clearly indicate whether your work should be completed independently or with a team.

When working on **individual tasks**, you are expected to:

- Take full ownership of your research, writing, and decision-making.
- Complete work without copying from others, sharing files, or using AI tools in unauthorized ways.
- Reflect independently on your thought process and growth.

When engaged in **group work**, you are expected to:

- Share responsibility for the task, planning and executing alongside your teammates.
- Communicate proactively, respectfully, and consistently.
- Contribute ideas, give and receive feedback, and support mutual success.
- Acknowledge each team member's input when submitting shared work.

Group work is not simply about dividing tasks—it's about **collaborating to think through complexity** together. In outsourcing, your ability to coordinate across teams, time zones, and stakeholder needs is often more important than your ability to execute solo. Treat each group milestone as a professional simulation of real project teamwork.

Academic Integrity in Scenario Work

In this problem-based practicum, you will often be placed into **complex, role-based situations** (called *Outsourcing Briefs*) that require critical thinking and originality. These situations mimic the ambiguity of real-world outsourcing—where the right answer is not always obvious, and your reasoning matters as much as your result.

That makes **academic integrity** even more important. Your responses to each brief should be your own:

- Do not copy content from classmates or online sources.
- Do not ask others to "review and rewrite" your individual tasks.
- Do not submit AI-generated text unless explicitly allowed.
- If working in a team, clearly document and distribute authorship and responsibilities.

Your submissions should represent not only *what you think*, but *how you think*. Plagiarism or dishonesty undercuts your own learning, and it undermines the reflective growth that this practicum is designed to support.

If you're ever unsure what's allowed—ask. Integrity is not about never making mistakes. It's about **owning your work and being honest in your process**.

Ethical Outsourcing Decisions

Ethical thinking doesn't stop at academic honesty. As a future outsourcing leader, you'll be asked to make decisions that impact people, communities, and entire industries. Throughout this practicum, you will be encouraged to think beyond cost, scope, and delivery to consider:

- Is the vendor I'm selecting aligned with fair labor practices?
- Are we respecting data privacy, IP ownership, and cultural boundaries?
- Are we communicating clearly and transparently with all stakeholders?
- Are we managing conflicts of interest or power imbalances appropriately?

The outsourcing decisions you make in this practicum may be simulated—but the **ethical reasoning you build is real**. You'll have opportunities to reflect on ethical tensions in your milestone write-ups and discussions, and you are encouraged to speak up when something doesn't sit right.

Why This Matters

In the real world, **people trust people who demonstrate integrity, especially under pressure**. Clients, teammates, and vendors will remember how you responded to a missed deadline, a disagreement, or a gray-area decision.

By holding yourself to high standards here—in collaboration, decision-making, and personal conduct—you are becoming the kind of leader others want to work with. You're not just learning outsourcing. You're learning how to **lead it—ethically, responsibly, and with character**.

This page titled 1.8: Collaboration and Integrity is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

1.9: Problem-Based Learning Student Guide

A Survival and Success Manual for Practicum-Based Learning

Welcome to the Experience

This isn't a typical textbook. And this won't be a typical learning experience.

You are entering a **Problem-Based Learning (PBL)** environment—an immersive, simulation-driven approach where you will learn by doing, deciding, reflecting, and iterating. This guide will help you understand what that means, how to succeed, and what's expected of you.

Here, your success won't come from memorizing definitions or acing multiple-choice quizzes. It will come from navigating ambiguity, producing professional-quality work, managing relationships, and building the kind of judgment and initiative that employers crave and the world demands.

This guide outlines the foundational principles, expectations, and strategies that will help you make the most of your journey.

What Makes PBL Different?

It's not passive. It's hands-on.

You'll be solving real-world problems, not watching someone else solve them. Each chapter or milestone is built around a **challenge** (called an *Outsourcing Brief*, *Client Directive*, or *Project Memo*, depending on the book). Your job is to respond as a professional—not a student.

Instead of receiving content first and applying it later, you'll **encounter the problem first**, then seek out the learning you need to solve it.

You're in role from day one.

You won't be playing yourself. You'll be playing a role—a project manager, a team lead, a data analyst, a strategist, or a business consultant. These roles aren't theatrical; they're professionally grounded and help you practice decision-making, documentation, and communication under realistic pressure.

The more seriously you take the role, the more immersive—and transformative—your learning will be.

The path is yours to navigate.

No one will tell you exactly what to do, and that's the point. You'll be given direction, tools, and guardrails—but not a step-by-step checklist. PBL values *agency* and *ownership*. Just like in a real organization, you'll be asked to:

- Clarify objectives from a client or stakeholder
- Set priorities and timelines
- Make assumptions where information is missing
- Use good judgment under pressure
- Communicate your process and decisions clearly

Learning By Doing

This model is grounded in cognitive science: we remember what we experience, not what we memorize.

In PBL, you will:

- **Learn through action.** Concepts become clearer when you use them.
- **Fail safely.** Mistakes are part of learning here. You are encouraged to try, get feedback, and improve.
- **Reflect continuously.** After every milestone, you'll be asked to reflect on your decisions, growth, and areas for improvement.

On average, expect to spend:

- **50% of your time learning.** Reading, researching, watching tutorials, and reviewing examples.
- **50% of your time producing.** Drafting, designing, writing, editing, revising, and submitting.

This balance mirrors how professionals work—always learning, always delivering.

Collaboration and Integrity

Group Work vs. Individual Tasks

Each book clearly defines which tasks are team-based and which are individual. In both cases, your contributions must reflect your effort, your voice, and your growth.

- **Individual Tasks:** You are responsible for original thinking, writing, and delivery. Your work should reflect what *you* have learned and how *you* would approach the problem.
- **Group Tasks:** You are expected to co-create, not divide and delegate. High-functioning teams share ideas, review drafts together, and push each other to refine outcomes. Distribute responsibility transparently.

Poor collaboration, freeloading, or withholding contributions undermines the learning environment—and your credibility.

Academic Integrity in PBL

This environment simulates the real world. That means **real-world integrity applies**.

- Do not submit anyone else's work as your own.
- Do not use generative AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude) unless explicitly allowed—and never without disclosure.
- Do not "borrow" content from previous cohorts, classmates, or websites.
- If using external ideas, sources, or templates, cite them clearly.

Reflection work is especially vulnerable to copy-paste temptation. Please resist. The only person who loses from a dishonest reflection is *you*.

Ethical Decision-Making

In PBL, you will face decisions that have no clean "right" answer—just like in real life. Some challenges will involve:

- Vendor trustworthiness
- Labor and ethical sourcing
- Stakeholder conflict
- Scope creep and budget pressure
- Data privacy and intellectual property

Use your role to **practice ethical reasoning**. Ask:

- "What values are at stake?"
- "Who is affected by this decision?"
- "What would I do in real life—and why?"

Ethics aren't extra. They're embedded. You are being trained to lead with competence *and* conscience.

How You'll Be Assessed

You are evaluated based on **how you think, act, grow, and perform—not just what you know**.

Assessment components and evaluation criteria for practicum performance.

Component	Weight	Evaluated By
Milestone Deliverables	xx%	Quality, clarity, and professionalism of work
Reflection & Growth Journals	xx%	Depth, insight, and evolution of thinking
Peer Collaboration & Feedback	xx%	Contribution to others' learning and success
Professional Conduct & Submission Quality	xx%	Timeliness, formatting, and communication style

You'll receive **rubrics** with every major task, covering:

- Alignment with the brief
- Soundness of decision-making
- Use of frameworks and tools
- Organization and tone
- Integration of feedback
- Progress across milestones

You're not just submitting deliverables. You're building a **track record** of performance.

The Feedback Loop

Feedback is not punishment. It's your growth engine.

- **Instructor Feedback** will challenge your thinking and elevate your execution.
- **Peer Feedback** will expose you to other ways of thinking.
- **Self-Reflection** will help you connect what you learned to how you learned it.

The more you engage with this loop, the faster your skills—and confidence—grow.

Tips to Succeed

1. **Start with the brief.** Read the challenge carefully. Who are you in this role? What's at stake?
2. **Use your tools.** Templates, checklists, and models are there to help. Don't reinvent the wheel.
3. **Balance learning and doing.** Don't get stuck in theory—or rush into production without understanding.
4. **Own your voice.** Don't just copy structure. Put yourself into your work.
5. **Ask questions.** Instructors and coaches are here to support—not to handhold, but to guide.
6. **Embrace iteration.** Your first draft is not your final draft. Improvement *is* the goal.
7. **Support your team.** Build relationships. Share feedback. Celebrate wins together.

Final Words

Problem-Based Learning isn't easy—but it is transformational.

You will finish this practicum with more than knowledge. You'll finish with confidence, clarity, and a portfolio of experiences that prove you know how to lead in complex, high-stakes situations. The process will stretch you. It will surprise you. And it will stay with you.

Now—step into your role. Let the learning begin.

This page titled 1.9: Problem-Based Learning Student Guide is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

1.10: Welcome to C-Bay Inc.

Inside the Software Development Division

You've just joined **C-Bay Inc.**, a fast-growing technology company headquartered in Sunnyvale, California. C-Bay specializes in integrated business solutions for small and mid-sized enterprises—combining hardware, software, cloud-based services, and ongoing client support. It serves industries ranging from healthcare to logistics, education to retail.

While C-Bay is known for its product breadth and reliability, its secret to success has always been its agility. And nowhere is that agility more visible—or more strained—than in the company's **Software Development Division**.

The Software Development Division: C-Bay's Innovation Engine

This division builds and maintains the custom software platforms that power C-Bay's enterprise solutions. The work here includes:

- Web-based business platforms
- Mobile apps for field operations
- Internal process automation tools
- API-driven services for hardware integration
- Custom builds for key enterprise clients

Over 40 professionals—developers, designers, analysts, testers, and project managers—keep these systems evolving to meet client needs.

But lately, **the workload has grown faster than the team**. Agile sprint plans are overbooked. Key deliverables are delayed. And high-value initiatives are sitting in the backlog because the internal staff simply can't stretch any further.

Leadership has made a decision: **strategic outsourcing is no longer optional—it's a priority.**

Your Role: Leading C-Bay's Outsourcing Push

You've been brought in as a **project lead** within a special initiative inside the Software Development Division. Your task is to help C-Bay develop and implement a modern, efficient outsourcing strategy—across multiple projects and partners.

Your role will evolve across several scenarios, but your core responsibilities include:

- Analyzing current project backlogs and identifying what can be outsourced
- Communicating with internal stakeholders to define needs and constraints
- Creating vendor-facing documents like SOWs and RFPs
- Managing vendor evaluation and selection
- Overseeing project delivery and resolving issues with external teams
- Closing contracts, collecting lessons learned, and recommending improvements

You are not an assistant. You are **a decision-maker**. And your work will directly impact C-Bay's ability to deliver for its clients.

Why You're Being Introduced to C-Bay

C-Bay isn't just a fictional company for background—it's the **foundation of every milestone and scenario** in this practicum.

You'll be working **inside C-Bay** throughout the book. Every chapter is designed as a professional challenge drawn from the company's internal operations. You'll receive memos, requests, and project briefs from C-Bay's leaders, just as you would in a real job.

Each milestone you complete—whether it's planning a procurement strategy, writing an RFP, or evaluating a vendor proposal—will be set within a **realistic, evolving C-Bay context**. This gives you:

- A **cohesive story** to follow across multiple deliverables
- A **business environment** that reflects cross-functional dynamics
- A **clear sense of purpose** for each task you complete
- The opportunity to **develop judgment over time**—not just task-level skills

This format helps simulate the complexity of real work. Your decisions in one chapter may affect how you frame or defend a decision in the next. The C-Bay simulation keeps the learning immersive, connected, and professionally relevant.

Division Snapshot: How C-Bay Software Works

C-Bay Software division structure, technologies, operating model, and business constraints.

Function	Details
Platforms Supported	Web, mobile, internal tools, cloud APIs
Methodology	Agile/Scrum with Jira-based sprints
Tech Stack	React, Node.js, Python, Java, SQL, Azure, GitHub, Postman, Figma
Team Size	~40 developers, QA engineers, designers, PMs
Outsourcing Targets	QA automation, UI/UX prototyping, mobile app modules, legacy system refactor
Constraints	Limited headcount, tight deadlines, global client SLAs, IP compliance

Key Stakeholders

Throughout the simulation, you'll interact (indirectly) with a variety of C-Bay roles. These may appear as memos, chat transcripts, meeting notes, or internal documentation. Treat them like real people. They expect you to:

- Deliver clear, well-reasoned recommendations
- Balance speed, quality, and risk
- Ask smart questions—and not waste their time
- Think strategically while managing the day-to-day details

Stakeholders you'll likely engage with:

- **Director of Software Delivery** – owns project timelines and quality
- **Product Manager** – focused on features, user needs, and market deadlines
- **QA Lead** – responsible for testing scope and tools
- **Procurement Advisor** – supports vendor screening and contracting
- **Legal Counsel** – reviews IP, contract language, and vendor compliance
- **CFO or CEO** – reviews vendor selection and cost justifications

What This Division Represents

C-Bay's Software Development Division is under pressure to scale—without compromising its culture of accountability and excellence. Outsourcing has the potential to solve many problems—but only if it's done right.

You're being brought in to make sure it is.

With each milestone, you'll see more of how the division operates, where it struggles, and where you can add value. You'll learn what it means to lead—not just in theory, but in practice—inside a real business context.

This page titled 1.10: Welcome to C-Bay Inc. is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

1.11: Forming Teams for the Practicum

Why We Start with Teams

In the real world, no outsourcing project is executed alone. Success depends on **collaboration—across roles, departments, geographies, and even cultures**. That's why this practicum begins by organizing learners into small, functional teams.

Your team will be your **operating unit** throughout the practicum. Together, you'll tackle strategic decisions, prepare professional deliverables, and simulate the dynamics of real-life outsourcing project teams.

Just like a vendor team inside a real company, your group will work under pressure, manage ambiguity, and rely on each other to meet shared goals. Your outputs will be reviewed and evaluated, and your **ability to work as a team** will shape not only your grade—but your learning experience.

Your Team's First Mission: Launch and Alignment

Before diving into Milestone 1, you'll meet briefly in a breakout room to complete your **Team Launch Activity**. Treat this as your onboarding. Every successful project begins with clear roles, mutual expectations, and operational structure.

Your Breakout Task:

- Establish your **team name**
- Assign **initial roles** (Project Manager, Communicator, etc.)
- Nominate a **Google Drive Administrator**
- Set up your **folder system and file access**
- Choose a **communication platform**
- Draft a brief **Team Collaboration Agreement**

Team Setup Instructions

Step 1: Join Your Assigned Team

You will be assigned to a team of **2–7 members**, depending on class size. All team structures are valid—as long as work is distributed equitably and communication is consistent.

You will have **5–10 minutes** in a breakout session to complete the following team setup.

Step 2: Complete the Team Launch Exercise

Team launch activities for establishing roles, ownership, and collaboration norms.

Task	Instructions
Team Name	Choose something fun, professional, or meaningful to your group.
Assign Roles	See list below. Every person should take on a primary role (or rotate as needed).

Task	Instructions
Google Drive Owner	One person creates the folder system and ensures all teammates have access.
Team Collaboration Agreement	Discuss your norms and document your working agreement (see Step 5).

Step 3: Assign Core Roles (Adaptable for Any Team Size)

Core team roles and responsibilities for project coordination, communication, reporting, and documentation.

Role	Description
Project Manager (PM)	Oversees scope, schedules, team progress, and holds team accountable
Communicator	Speaks on behalf of the team with the instructor and coordinates with other teams
Status Report Lead	Compiles weekly or milestone reports on team progress and challenges
Google Doc Admin	Sets up folders, tracks version control, ensures document integrity
Notetaker (All)	Each team member keeps personal reflection notes and updates in their folder

For smaller teams: combine roles (e.g., PM and Status Reporter)
For larger teams: assign deputies or rotate roles every milestone

Step 4: Create a Shared Google Drive Folder

The Google Doc Administrator creates the following structure and shares with the instructor:

css

CopyEdit

- [Team Name] - C-Bay Practicum
- │
- ├── Deliverables
- │ ├── Game 1
- │ ├── Game 2
- │ └── Game 3
- │
- ├── Notes
- │ ├── [Your Name Here]
- │ └── ...
- │

- ├── Status Reports
- │ ├── Week 1
- │ ├── Week 2
- │ └── Week 3
- │
- ├── Working Folder
- │ ├── Game 1
- │ ├── Game 2
- │ └── Game 3

Ensure:

- Everyone has **edit access**
- Files follow this format: TeamName_Milestone#_DocumentType_v1.docx
- Folder updates are **weekly** and deliverables are uploaded in the correct place

Step 5: Draft a Team Collaboration Agreement

This one-page document defines **how you'll work together**. Use the following prompts:

- How often will we meet and communicate?
- What tools will we use (Slack, Google Chat, etc.)?
- How will we give and receive feedback?
- How will we handle absences or missed deadlines?
- Will we rotate roles? If so, how often?
- What will we do if a team member is unresponsive or not contributing?

Save as: TeamName_CollaborationAgreement.docx
Upload to: your root team folder

Revisit your agreement at least once mid-way through the practicum

Step 6: Set Up Your Communication Platform

Pick a tool that all members can use regularly (outside of email). Options include:

- Slack, Discord, WhatsApp, GroupMe, Microsoft Teams
- Use Google Calendar or Doodle for scheduling
- Optionally create a Trello board or shared checklist for tracking tasks

Step 7: Report Back to Main Room

Come back ready to share:

- Your team name
- Who holds each role
- Confirmation that your folder is set up and accessible
- Any questions or concerns that came up in your discussion

Weekly Status Reports

Each week (or milestone), the **Status Report Lead** uploads a 1-page report using this format:

- **What was accomplished?**
- **What's still in progress?**
- **What blockers or risks exist?**

- **What support is needed (if any)?**

Upload to: Status Reports > Week X

Final Checklist Before Milestone 1

- Selected a team name
- Assigned roles (and listed them in the folder index)
- Created and shared your folder with the instructor
- Documented your Team Collaboration Agreement
- Chosen your communication platform
- Uploaded your first notes
- Scheduled your next team check-in

Sample Team Collaboration Agreement

[Team Name]: C-Bay Practicum Collaboration Agreement
Date Created: [Insert Date]
Last Updated: [Insert Date]

Meeting Frequency and Format

We agree to meet once a week on Mondays at 6:00 PM via Zoom.
Additional ad hoc meetings will be scheduled around major deliverables.
Meeting duration: 45–60 minutes
Attendance is expected unless prior notice is given.

Communication Platform

Slack is our main team chat.
We created a private channel called #cbay-practicum-teamname.
Google Chat will be used for quick updates, and all final announcements will be posted in Slack.

Deliverable Deadlines

Deliverables are due by 9:00 PM the night before the final submission.
A draft version must be ready for team review at least 48 hours before that deadline.

Role Rotation Policy

Roles will be assigned per milestone and rotated every two weeks.
Each member will serve as Project Manager once during the practicum.
We maintain a shared doc to track who held each role and when.

Feedback and Peer Communication

Team feedback will be constructive, timely, and focused on the work—not the person.
Suggestions will be delivered privately or during team meetings, and everyone is encouraged to speak up.

Accountability and Escalation

If a teammate becomes unresponsive:

- The Project Manager will reach out within 24 hours.
- If there is no reply within 48 hours, the issue will be escalated to the instructor.
- Missed commitments may result in reassignment of tasks.

Documentation and Version Control

All files will follow this format:
TeamName_Milestone#_DocumentType_Initials_v1.docx
The Google Doc Admin will maintain version history and file organization.

Ground Rules

- Be respectful of different working styles and backgrounds
- No ghosting—communicate early and honestly if overwhelmed
- Support one another's learning goals, not just the grade
- Revisit this agreement after Milestone 2 for updates

Team Members and Initial Roles:

Team roster and initial role assignments for Milestone 1 project activities.

Name	Role (Milestone 1)	Contact Info
[Name 1]	Project Manager	[Email / Slack ID]
[Name 2]	Status Report Lead	
[Name 3]	Communicator	
[Name 4]	Google Drive Admin	
[Name 5]	Notetaker	

Instructor Copy Shared? Yes
Stored in Folder: /TeamName - C-Bay Practicum/Team Charter/CollaborationAgreement.docx

Final Thought

A strong project doesn't start with deliverables—it starts with trust, structure, and shared commitment.

You're not just organizing a project.
You're launching a **professional unit** inside a simulated company.

Start like you mean to lead. And lead like it's real—because it is.

This page titled 1.11: Forming Teams for the Practicum is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

1.12: Project Management Basics

A Thinking Framework for Practicum-Based Leaders

What Is Project Management?

At its core, **project management (PM)** is the art and science of turning ideas into actionable outcomes—on time, within budget, and with the right level of quality. Whether you're launching a product, implementing a software update, or managing an outsourcing strategy, all projects share one thing: **they have a defined beginning, middle, and end**.

You don't need to be a technical expert to manage a project. But you do need to understand **how projects function**—and how to coordinate the people, processes, and priorities that make them successful.

The 5 Project Phases

Every project moves through a lifecycle of phases. These phases are not always perfectly linear—but understanding each one helps you think like a **Project Manager (PM)**:

Phase 1: Initiation

This is the "why" of your project. It includes:

- Writing a **Project Charter**
- Conducting a **feasibility analysis**
- Identifying basic **goals and constraints**
- Getting **approval** to move forward

The goal of initiation is to define the project at a high level and ensure it's worth doing.

Phase 2: Planning

Here is where real thinking happens. As a PM, your job is to help the team answer:

- **What** exactly are we building?
- **When** will we do it?
- **Who** is involved?
- **Why** does this matter?
- **Where** will it take place (physically or digitally)?
- **How** will it be done?

You'll define the **scope**, **schedule**, **budget**, **quality expectations**, and **team roles**. This is also where you:

- Build the **Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)**
- Identify task dependencies (what must be done before what)
- Estimate time and resources
- Develop the **critical path** (the minimum time to complete the project)

Phase 3: Execution

This is the "doing" phase—but that doesn't mean the PM is doing all the work.

The PM's job during execution is to:

- Coordinate the team
- Facilitate meetings
- Keep track of deliverables
- Make sure the project stays aligned with the plan
- Surface any risks, blockers, or process issues

You'll rely on **subject matter experts (SMEs)** for actual work execution. Your role is to ensure progress continues, not to build the product yourself.

Phase 4: Control

This is the PM's "traffic light" system. It happens **continuously across all phases**.

In the control phase, you:

- Monitor progress
- Track risks
- Adjust timelines
- Manage changes to scope
- Ensure quality standards are met
- Make tradeoffs as necessary

In this practicum, control is our central focus.
You will learn tools to monitor your project without micromanaging, and to see when something is drifting off-track—even before it becomes a problem.

Closing

Projects must end well. That includes:

- Delivering final outcomes
- Holding a team **retrospective or lessons learned session**
- Celebrating milestones
- Closing contracts and archiving documentation

Closing is where you reflect not just on *what* was done, but *how* it was done—and how the team can grow.

The 5 Pillars of Every Phase

Whether you're in planning, execution, or closing, every phase of the project touches five essential pillars. These should always be on your radar:

Five foundational project planning pillars used to define scope, timing, resources, quality expectations, and team responsibilities.

Pillar	What It Means
Scope	What is in (and out of) the project's boundaries
Schedule	When things will happen; the timeline and its dependencies
Budget	What resources (time, money, people) are available

Pillar	What It Means
Quality	What standards the final product must meet
Team	Who is involved, what are their roles, and how they work together

Think of these five like the dashboard of your car—if one starts blinking, the whole vehicle may be in trouble.

The PM's Thinking Framework

As a Project Manager, you are not responsible for doing the actual technical work—but you are responsible for thinking clearly, coordinating wisely, and **asking the right questions**.

Here's the mindset you need:

- **Time Management System:** Ensure the team is working from shared expectations and a realistic plan.
- **Abstract Thinking:** See patterns, anticipate needs, and understand the "why" behind decisions.
- **Navigator, Not Operator:** You don't fix the engine—you steer the car. When a problem arises, you rely on SMEs for answers, but you stay in charge of coordination.

Risks vs. Constraints: Know the Difference

Part of your job is to **mitigate risk**—to notice things before they derail the project.

Key distinctions between project risks and constraints when assessing potential impacts on project outcomes.

Term	Definition
Risk	A future event that might happen (positive or negative) and could affect the project.
Constraint	A condition or fact that already exists and may help or hurt the project outcome.

Risk Example:

"If the mobile team misses their API handoff deadline, our UI will be delayed."
This is a **future problem** you can plan around or mitigate.

Constraint Example:

"We already signed a contract that limits our vendor to 40 hours/week."
This is a **fixed condition**. You must manage within it.

Understanding the Work: Projects and Work Packages

What is a Project?

A **project** is a quantifiable unit of work with a defined start and finish. It is unique, time-bound, and creates value.

What is a Work Package?

Every project can be broken into **work packages**—subcomponents that are easier to manage.

Each work package includes:

- A mini scope
- Quality criteria
- Timeline
- Resource requirements (team, money, tools)

You can think of work packages like **Lego blocks**—each one is structured and trackable, but they fit together to create a cohesive final product.

In Summary: Your Role as PM in This Practicum

Throughout this practicum, you will practice **real-world project management thinking** by:

- Scoping problems clearly
- Planning timelines and deliverables
- Managing team dynamics
- Anticipating and responding to risks
- Using tools to control progress
- Closing projects with professionalism

You won't be asked to do the technical work. But you will be expected to **lead with clarity**, coordinate with confidence, and make decisions like someone preparing for a real PM role.

Remember: a great project manager doesn't always know the answer.
But they **always know how to find the person who does.**

This page titled 1.12: Project Management Basics is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2: INTRODUCTION TO OUTSOURCING

From Strategy to Execution in Global Partnerships

Outsourcing today is a strategic tool for agility, not just cost-cutting. Section 2 reframes outsourcing by exploring why companies outsource, who performs the work, and how these choices shape operations. Real-world case studies like Walmart and Boeing reveal how outsourcing can drive efficiency—or spark setbacks. The section then guides you through the entire procurement lifecycle: crafting strategy, writing SOWs and RFPs, evaluating vendors, negotiating contracts, and managing performance. You'll gain practical skills and a strategic mindset, treating procurement as a core project management discipline. By the end, you'll be ready to lead successful global sourcing efforts from start to finish.

2.1: Outsourcing – What It Means Today

2.1.1: Case Study- Walmart - The 100,000 T-Shirts

2.1.2: Case Study- Boeing and the Outsourcing Dilemma

2.2: The Procurement and Solicitation Process

2.2.1: Procurement and Solicitation – The Work Before the Work

2.2.2: Step 1 - Procurement Strategy – Laying the Groundwork

2.2.3: Step 2- Establish Requirements – Getting the Documentation Right

2.2.4: Step 3- Statement of Work (SOW) – Defining the Relationship

2.2.5: Step 4- Request for Proposal (RFP) – Finding the Right Fit

2.2.6: Step 5- Vendor Response Evaluation – More Than Numbers

2.2.7: Step 6- Contract Negotiation and Signing – Setting Legal Ground Rules

2.2.8: Step 7- Monitoring and Control – Staying in the Loop

2.2.9: Deliverables from the Procurement Process

2.2.10: Final Thoughts- The Project Manager's Role in Procurement

2.2.11: Step 8- Contract Management and Closure – Delivering and Wrapping Up

2.3: Case Study

2.3.1: Planning for Outsourcing

2.3.2: Initiation- Exploring Outsourcing Options for the Reckon Project

2.3.3: Plan of Attack- Making the Case for Smart Outsourcing

2.3.4: Planning for Outsourcing – Student Workbook

2.3.4.1: SWOT Analysis for Outsourcing Justification

2.3.4.2: Make-or-Buy Analysis

2.3.4.3: Contract Type Evaluation

2.3.4.4: Supplier Selection Plan

2.3.4.5: Risk Management Plan

2.3.4.6: Reflection Questions and Lessons Learned

2.3.4.7: Submission Checklist and Final Assembly

2.3.4.8: Reflection and Final Submission

This page titled 2: Introduction to Outsourcing is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.1: Outsourcing – What It Means Today

Introduction

Framing the Decision Before the Vendor Conversation Begins

Outsourcing is not just a procurement tactic—it is a strategic decision that reshapes how organizations operate, innovate, and scale. Before students begin planning how to outsource, it's critical to understand what outsourcing actually is, how it differs from offshoring, and why companies choose to do it.

Outsourcing refers to the transfer of a business function or process to an external provider, typically one that specializes in that function. The goal is to gain efficiency, reduce cost, improve quality, or free up internal resources to focus on more strategic tasks. Importantly, **outsourcing is about responsibility**, not location. A firm can outsource work to a third party down the street or across the globe.

Offshoring, by contrast, refers specifically to moving work to another country—regardless of who performs it. A company might offshore work to its own branch in another country (captive offshoring), or it might outsource that work to a foreign vendor. While these terms are often used interchangeably, they represent different strategic choices.

Why Companies Outsource

Organizations outsource for many reasons, including:

- **Cost savings**: Reducing labor, infrastructure, or overhead expenses
- **Focus**: Enabling internal teams to concentrate on core business functions
- **Speed**: Scaling up production or delivery timelines without hiring internally
- **Expertise**: Gaining access to specialized skills or new technologies
- **Scalability**: Adjusting capacity based on demand without long-term commitments
- **Global reach**: Supporting international operations or customer bases.

However, outsourcing is not always the right answer. Poorly structured outsourcing relationships can lead to hidden costs, quality breakdowns, vendor dependency, and loss of institutional knowledge. The key is not just **whether to outsource**, but **what to outsource, to whom, and under what conditions**.

Strategic Framing for This Milestone

In this milestone, you will take on the role of a project leader advising C-Bay's leadership team on whether to outsource development work for a critical product known as Reckon. This will require you to:

- Understand the organization's internal capacity and limitations
- Identify which project components are good candidates for outsourcing
- Evaluate the potential risks and rewards
- Recommend contract structures and vendor selection strategies
- Support your reasoning with clear, structured tools

Your goal is not to produce a perfect answer—it is to apply **structured, professional reasoning** to a real-world planning challenge. This includes balancing tradeoffs, thinking like a strategist, and communicating recommendations with clarity.

This chapter will give you the foundation to do just that.

What Is Outsourcing?

At its simplest, **outsourcing** is the practice of hiring an external party to handle work that would otherwise be done internally. It can apply to entire business functions (e.g., customer service), technical components (e.g., software development), or even microtasks. (e.g., designing a logo).

But modern outsourcing is **not just delegation**—and it's not just about cutting costs. It's about gaining access to expertise, moving faster, managing risk, and staying focused on what your organization does best.

Think of outsourcing as a strategic partnership, not a shortcut.

Distinctions

- **Outsourcing ≠ Offshoring**: Offshoring is about *location*. Outsourcing is about *ownership* of work. You can outsource to a local firm, a nearshore team, or a global vendor.
- **Outsourcing ≠ Freelancing**: Freelancers may be hired for one-off gigs. Outsourcing usually involves structured contracts, defined deliverables, and team-based execution.

Types of Outsourcing (with Examples)

Understanding outsourcing today requires breaking it down by **function, model, and geography**.

By Function: What Work Is Being Outsourced?

IT & Software Development

- *Example: A 5-person health tech startup in Austin outsources its mobile app development to a firm in Argentina.*
- *Why?* They can't afford a full-time engineer, but need a beautiful, functional MVP in 6 weeks.

Customer Service

- *Example: Walmart outsources large portions of its customer support to BPOs in the Philippines and India.*
- *Why?* To handle 24/7 call volume cost-effectively while maintaining service quality.

Marketing & Design

- *Example: A new e-commerce brand uses Fiverr and Upwork to hire freelance designers, copywriters, and video editors.*
- *Why?* They need quick turnaround and access to diverse creative styles.

HR, Payroll, and Benefits

- *Example: A midsize construction firm in the U.S. uses TriNet to manage all HR compliance, payroll, and hiring tools.*
- *Why?* HR is not their strength—they'd rather pay a specialist.

By Model: How the Work Is Structured

Staff Augmentation

- *Example: Boeing hires a team of contract systems engineers through a staffing agency during a peak production cycle.*
- *Why?* To increase short-term capacity without expanding permanent headcount.

Managed Services

- *Example*: A hospital outsources its entire IT helpdesk to a managed services provider (MSP).
- *Why?* They want fixed monthly costs and 24/7 support without managing a team.

Project-Based Outsourcing

- *Example*: A fintech startup hires a boutique UX firm to redesign its customer dashboard.
- *Why?* They need world-class design, but only for 8 weeks.

Business Process Outsourcing (BPO)

- *Example*: A large regional bank outsources mortgage application processing to a BPO firm in India.
- *Why?* The process is routine, repeatable, and resource-intensive.

By Geography: Where the Work Happens

Onshore (Domestic Outsourcing)

- *Example*: A California school district outsources web development to a local vendor to comply with data regulations.
- *Why?* To simplify communication, maintain regulatory compliance, and enable closer collaboration with local teams.

Nearshore

- *Example*: A Canadian logistics firm works with a Colombian software vendor to align with time zones and reduce communication lag.
- *Why?* To balance cost savings with geographic proximity, overlapping work hours, and cultural alignment.

Offshore

- *Example*: Microsoft maintains long-term development partnerships with firms in India, Poland, and Vietnam.
- *Why?* To leverage cost advantages and 24-hour development cycles.

Why Organizations Outsource Today

Outsourcing used to be mostly about **cutting costs**. Today, that's just one piece of the puzzle.

Table 2.1.1: Outsourcing Reasons

Reason	Explanation
Speed & Scalability	Add capacity without new hires or infrastructure
Focus on Core Competencies	Keep your best people focused on what you do best
Access to Expertise	Work with specialists in AI, design, finance, or QA
Cost Efficiency	Optimize labor and operating costs
Flexibility & Risk Sharing	Test ideas without long-term commitments
Innovation & Continuous Delivery	Partner with vendors to launch faster, innovate quicker

Example: Netflix relies on third-party vendors to localize subtitles and content metadata for global launches. This lets them move faster while focusing in-house teams on content creation.

What Makes Outsourcing Work (or Fail)?

Successful outsourcing isn't just about who you hire—it's about how you plan, manage, and maintain the relationship.

Success Factors:

- Clear scope, expectations, and deliverables
- Detailed Statements of Work (SOW) and Service Level Agreements (SLAs)
- Communication rhythms (e.g., weekly check-ins)
- Mutual respect and cultural awareness
- A strong internal point of contact (usually the PM!)

Pitfalls to Avoid:

- Vague project definitions
- Underestimating onboarding time
- Choosing based on price over fit
- Not tracking performance (no KPIs or quality gates)
- Ignoring time zones, language barriers, or security risks

Example: Boeing famously suffered delays and cost overruns in the 787 Dreamliner program due to overly complex global outsourcing without proper integration or control.

Trends in Modern Outsourcing

Outsourcing is evolving rapidly, especially in the post-pandemic, AI-driven world.

Key Trends

- **Remote-first relationships:** Distributed teams are the norm, not the exception
- **AI-assisted outsourcing:** Chatbots, code review, and analytics augment human work
- **Gig economy:** On-demand talent for microtasks (Fiverr, Toptal, Upwork)
- **Ethical sourcing:** Pressure to evaluate vendors based on labor conditions and sustainability
- **Security & compliance:** Data handling and IP protection are now make-or-break issues
- **Nearshoring resurgence:** Firms prioritize cultural and time-zone alignment over pure cost

Example: Patagonia evaluates vendor sustainability practices before engaging in any contract manufacturing.

Your Role in the Outsourcing Process

As a project manager (PM) or practicum lead, you are **not** doing the outsourced work.

Instead, your responsibilities include:

- **Planning what should be outsourced** (and what shouldn't)
- **Coordinating vendor onboarding**
- **Monitoring quality and progress**
- **Managing communication and reporting**
- **Escalating issues or adjusting scope**
- **Ensuring final delivery and documentation**

You're the bridge between **internal priorities** and **external execution**.

Think of yourself as the translator between business needs and vendor capabilities.

How You'll Practice Outsourcing in This Book

In this practicum, you'll simulate managing outsourcing through a fictional company: **C-Bay Inc.**

You will:

- Analyze a growing software backlog
- Decide what parts of a product can or should be outsourced
- Prepare an RFP
- Evaluate vendor responses
- Manage timelines and expectations
- Close contracts and document lessons learned

Summary (A Strategic Skillset)

Outsourcing is no longer just a vendor transaction. It's a **strategic function** that, when done well, enables companies to move faster, think smarter, and scale responsibly. As a PM or team lead, your job is not to do the work, but to make the work possible—and sustainable. Outsourcing is not about handing off responsibility. It's about **managing it through partnership**.

Reflection & Team Discussion Prompt

Think-Pair-Share:

1. Have you ever interacted with an outsourced product or service (e.g., calling support, using a delivery app, or submitting payroll)?
2. If you were starting a business today, what would you outsource first—and why?
3. What worries would you have about outsourcing something core to your mission?

This page titled 2.1: Outsourcing – What It Means Today is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.1.1: Case Study- Walmart - The 100,000 T-Shirts

How Walmart Outsourced a Commodity—and Engineered a Global Procurement Machine

The fluorescent lights buzzed faintly in the 5th floor of Walmart's Global Sourcing office in Shenzhen. It was just after 8:00 AM, and the room smelled like instant coffee and anticipation.

Jin Yao, a regional sourcing coordinator, leaned over her laptop, watching a line of numbers flicker and shift on the screen. Across the office, her manager, David, stood by the whiteboard where the day's target was written in marker:
"100K Units – Men's Cotton/Poly Blend Tee – Target FOB: $1.97"

They had 11 pre-qualified manufacturers dialed in across China, Bangladesh, and Vietnam—each with open access to the **reverse auction platform** Walmart had spent two years refining.

The T-shirt itself was simple. A blend of 60% cotton, 40% polyester. Crew neck. Four SKUs based on color, three standard sizes, double-stitched. Nothing fancy—but it had to feel good, wash well, and ship on time. And Walmart needed 100,000 of them in stores across the U.S. in six weeks.

But today wasn't about fabric or fashion.
Today was about **sourcing at scale**—and **squeezing pennies without snapping the elastic.**

The Reverse Auction Begins

At 8:15 AM, the bidding window opened. From Hanoi to Guangzhou, factory managers logged into the secure portal and began adjusting their prices in real time.

The rules were simple:

- The auction would last 20 minutes.
- Each vendor could see where they ranked, but not who they were up against.
- Only pre-qualified suppliers—those who had passed labor audits, sample inspections, and delivery history—could participate.
- The winner would receive a contract to produce 100,000 units for nationwide distribution.

Jin watched the bids drop.

$2.06.
$2.01.
$1.99.
Then, with three minutes left:
$1.968—just below Walmart's internal target.

"Looks like Yunnan Textiles is in the lead," David murmured. "But let's see if Shandong tries to undercut at the buzzer."

What Made This Work

This wasn't just about picking the lowest bidder. That's a mistake rookie buyers make.

Instead, Jin and David had already:

- Verified factory certifications (WRAP, ISO9001, Sedex)
- Received lab test results on shrinkage, dye retention, and pilling
- Analyzed historical on-time delivery performance
- Reviewed raw cotton sourcing trails for compliance with U.S. Customs Modernization Act

- Pre-loaded the Statement of Work into the auction portal, detailing packaging specs, shipping labels, and pallet configurations

Each supplier was bidding **not just on price**, but on the full scope of deliverables. Walmart's expectations were non-negotiable. The price, however, was up for war.

"It's not about racing to the bottom," David had explained to a group of interns the week before.
"It's about finding the right partner who can meet standards—and win efficiently."

Post-Auction (The Real Work Begins)

By 8:36 AM, the auction closed. Yunnan Textiles had won with a final bid of **$1.964 per unit FOB** (freight on board), shaving nearly $6,000 from the cost compared to the highest initial bid.

But now the countdown clock started:

- Materials had to be ordered and cut within 48 hours.
- Threads had to match Walmart's proprietary PMS color codes.
- Stitching instructions had to be pulled from the shared tech pack.
- Cartons had to be printed with bilingual barcodes.
- First article production samples had to be delivered to Shenzhen in four days.

Jin wasn't celebrating. She was already emailing Yunnan's quality liaison to confirm shipment staging at Ningbo Port and verify container availability. One missed vessel could throw off Walmart's nationwide promotion calendar.

Meanwhile, in Arkansas, a team of merchandisers was finalizing signage and floor placement strategies for the June "Basics Blowout" event. They had no idea how many systems, people, and documents had already moved to make those $1.97 T-shirts happen.

The Project Manager's Role

Walmart's sourcing team doesn't sew. They don't even visit the factory anymore—much of the auditing is third-party, and site visits are rare unless a red flag is raised.

But project managers like Jin manage everything else:

- They design the reverse auction structure.
- They coordinate with Walmart Legal to verify contract language.
- They ensure import compliance for country of origin labeling.
- They update vendor scorecards to track KPIs (quality, delivery, responsiveness).
- They escalate when delivery SLAs are missed or if payment milestones stall.
- And most critically, they serve as the **interface between global production and local execution.**

They don't choose the color of the shirt. But they **own the result**—in-store, on time, under cost.

The Risks Behind the Savings

Reverse auctions are powerful. But they carry risk:

- A supplier may bid too low and cut corners to protect their margin.
- Labor practices may suffer if vendor oversight is poor.
- Delivery timelines may slip if raw cotton from Pakistan arrives late.
- A breakdown in communication—over email, WeChat, or API—can trigger weeks of delays.

To mitigate this, Walmart builds in:

- A **tiered supplier system** (Gold, Silver, Blacklist)

- Continuous quality sampling
- Surprise audits via third-party agencies
- Daily milestone tracking by regional sourcing teams

The cost savings are real. But the system only works because the **controls are tighter than the stitches on the shirts themselves.**

Lessons for Practicum Leaders

This isn't just about fashion.

It's a vivid look at how:

- A basic commodity (a T-shirt) becomes the center of a global procurement strategy
- Reverse auctions can drive cost savings—but must be matched with strict quality controls
- The PM's job is not technical execution—it's **relationship orchestration**, **risk monitoring**, and **results delivery**

Walmart didn't outsource production to avoid work.
They outsourced to specialize—**so they could focus on designing systems instead of stitching shirts.**

This page titled 2.1.1: Case Study- Walmart - The 100,000 T-Shirts is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.1.2: Case Study- Boeing and the Outsourcing Dilemma

Engineering Dreams, Protecting Secrets – The Global Gamble of Building Big

Setting the Stage (A Plane That Could Change Everything)

In 2003, the mood at Boeing's Seattle headquarters was charged with ambition. The company had just announced its most daring commercial aviation project in decades: the **Boeing 787 Dreamliner**.

This new aircraft would be lighter, faster, more fuel-efficient, and built using carbon fiber composites rather than traditional aluminum. It would revolutionize long-haul travel—and Boeing intended to build it faster and cheaper than any wide-body jet before it.

But to do that, Boeing would need help.

Enter Global Outsourcing

Boeing made a bold decision: **outsource 70% of the Dreamliner's components to global partners**, many of whom had never before built commercial aircraft sections at this scale.

Rather than building everything in-house, Boeing would act as a **system integrator**—coordinating a vast global supply chain with vendors building wings, fuselages, avionics systems, and interiors. Major components would be **designed, manufactured, and even partially assembled in Japan, Italy, South Korea, Canada, and China**, then flown to final assembly lines in Everett, Washington and Charleston, South Carolina using custom-built Dreamlifter cargo planes.

Among these suppliers was **AVIC (Aviation Industry Corporation of China)**—a state-owned Chinese aerospace conglomerate.

Manufacturing in China: Promise and Risk

AVIC was selected to build rudders and composite trailing edge components for the Dreamliner's tail. These parts were relatively small—but strategically symbolic. Boeing hoped to deepen its footprint in the Chinese aviation market, where regulators held increasing sway over aircraft certification and sales.

But from the moment the contracts were signed, Boeing's **IP security teams were on high alert**.

Why?

- **China was not just a supplier—it was also a potential future competitor.**
  - The Chinese government was already funding the development of COMAC, a domestic jet manufacturer expected to compete with Boeing and Airbus by the 2020s.
- **Intellectual property leakage was not just theoretical—it was structural.**
  - Under Chinese joint venture laws, foreign companies were often required to share proprietary information with local partners in exchange for market access.
- **Cybersecurity threats were growing.**

Boeing had already been the target of multiple state-sponsored cyberattacks traced back to groups operating in China.

"We want the Chinese market," said one internal strategy memo, "but we also need to accept that what we teach today may become our competition tomorrow."

To mitigate risk, Boeing:

- Limited the scope of AVIC's access to proprietary design files
- Used "black box" subassembly design to conceal core engineering logic
- Implemented rigorous compartmentalization of source files and production tolerances
- Required AVIC to complete all work using Boeing-supplied machines and protocols

Still, tension simmered.

Engineering Meets Integration Challenges

By 2009, Boeing was **two years behind schedule** on the 787. The reasons were many: untested materials, late supplier deliveries, quality inconsistencies, and integration nightmares.

But one recurring issue was this: **outsourced components didn't always fit together.**

Some Chinese-built components arrived with deviations just millimeters off—but enough to require rework. Engineers in Everett joked that the plane was "more puzzle than platform."

A senior project manager put it bluntly:

"We were outsourcing precision work across 10 time zones, under 6 different legal regimes, and expecting it to snap together like Ikea furniture."

The Software Side: Outsourcing Code at Altitude

At the same time, Boeing was quietly expanding its **global software development outsourcing**, especially in India and Russia.

Much of this was for internal tools: configuration systems, simulation software, internal dashboards, and maintenance tracking platforms. But increasingly, Boeing began outsourcing parts of **embedded avionics software**—code that ran diagnostic and safety systems onboard aircraft.

This triggered internal debates.

Some engineers argued that outsourcing UI dashboards or internal data platforms was fine—but anything touching **safety systems** or aircraft telemetry was too sensitive.
Others believed that carefully managed outsourcing, with code reviews and controlled modules, was not only safe but **fiscally necessary** in an industry with razor-thin margins.

To strike a balance, Boeing:

- Required all mission-critical code to undergo internal security and reliability audits
- Enforced supplier development under **strict Software Engineering Institute (SEI) standards**
- Maintained full internal ownership of system architecture
- Divided software into "low risk" and "high risk" modules

Even so, when one news report in 2019 revealed that parts of the 737 MAX software had been written by outsourced contractors making $9/hour, Boeing faced public scrutiny—regardless of whether the code itself caused the issue.

The optics were damning.

"Boeing is outsourcing safety," critics said.

Internally, project managers were reminded of an old truth:
Outsourcing doesn't remove accountability. It just changes how you exercise it.

The IP Balance Sheet

So—was outsourcing worth it?

By 2021, Boeing's China-based suppliers had delivered millions of parts for 787s, 737s, and 777s. The Dreamliner program, despite delays, became a commercial success. And Boeing retained (for now) a strong presence in the Chinese aviation market.

But COMAC had also launched the C919—a narrow-body jet with clear echoes of Boeing and Airbus designs. Boeing's IP had not been stolen, but **some of its thinking had certainly been mirrored.**

The PMs in Seattle, Shenzhen, and Shanghai all understood one thing:

"If you're going to outsource manufacturing or software development to a potential rival, you'd better build a **system of containment, measurement, and compartmentalization**—or risk being out-built in 10 years."

Lessons for Project Managers

This case illustrates the **power and peril** of outsourcing complex work across borders.

As a PM, your role is to:

- Decide what's strategic and what's tactical
- Protect core IP while enabling global scale
- Manage multiple vendor relationships—some of which may evolve into competitors
- Segment workflows so that no one vendor has full ownership of your crown jewels
- Oversee delivery while maintaining compliance, quality, and integration

Outsourcing doesn't just lower costs. It exposes your architecture, your thinking, and sometimes your future. But with the right boundaries, it can **build dreams at a scale no internal team ever could.**

This page titled 2.1.2: Case Study- Boeing and the Outsourcing Dilemma is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.2: The Procurement and Solicitation Process

Procurement and Vendor Management Lifecycle

This section guides you through the full procurement and solicitation lifecycle—the essential “work before the work.” You’ll learn how to build a procurement strategy, define clear requirements, write a strong Statement of Work (SOW), and issue an effective RFP. From evaluating vendor responses to negotiating contracts, monitoring performance, and closing out engagements, each step prepares you to lead with clarity and confidence. The goal: ensure successful vendor relationships and high-impact outcomes through disciplined, strategic procurement practices.

This page titled 2.2: The Procurement and Solicitation Process is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.2.1: Procurement and Solicitation – The Work Before the Work

Choosing the Right Partner: Building the Foundation for Outsourced Success

Before a single line of code is written, before a vendor begins testing or designing a wireframe, before kickoff meetings and timelines—there is planning. And at the heart of that planning lies the **procurement and solicitation process**.

This chapter explores what happens before the work begins: the strategic, structured, and often complex process of selecting the right partner to do the right job. It's about **aligning technical needs with business goals**, translating requirements into clear expectations, and ensuring that every decision—vendor selection, cost structure, timeline, legal terms—is made with clarity, consistency, and control.

Through this chapter, you'll learn:

- How to define and document outsourcing needs
- How to craft an airtight Statement of Work (SOW)
- How to design and distribute a professional Request for Proposal (RFP)
- How to evaluate vendors objectively using scorecards and criteria
- How to negotiate, sign, and manage contracts
- And how to monitor and adjust the relationship to stay on track, on time, and on budget

You'll also see how procurement isn't just paperwork—it's **project architecture**. It's how organizations build relationships, protect resources, and control risk before the work even begins.

If you've ever wondered how companies choose *who* gets to do the work—and what separates smart outsourcing from chaotic handoffs—this chapter will answer that question.

Welcome to the pre-project project.
This is procurement done right.

How Modern Projects Secure the Right Vendors—and Make It Work

Procurement and solicitation aren't just about finding a vendor and signing a contract. They are the **strategic foundation of any successful outsourcing engagement**. Whether you're handing off a development sprint, a UX redesign, or an entire release cycle, what happens in the procurement phase defines **how clearly, how fairly, and how successfully** work gets done.

At C-Bay Inc., this process has been codified into a disciplined framework that ensures vendors are aligned, expectations are documented, and accountability is baked into every step. Below is a deeply detailed, practitioner-level guide to what this process looks like from **start to finish**, and what makes it not only function—but function well

This page titled 2.2.1: Procurement and Solicitation – The Work Before the Work is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.2.2: Step 1 - Procurement Strategy – Laying the Groundwork

Defining the Outsourcing Strategy

Before RFPs are sent out, before pricing sheets are compared, and before a single vendor is approached, the first—and most essential—question that project leaders at C-Bay ask is:

“What exactly are we trying to buy—and why can’t (or shouldn’t) we build it ourselves?”

This question is deceptively simple. But in practice, it requires **critical strategic thinking** about scope, ownership, internal capacity, and long-term value.

Start with the Strategic Why

Outsourcing should never be a knee-jerk reaction to short-term staffing pressure. Instead, the procurement process must begin with **strategic alignment**—a clear rationale for why certain functions or deliverables should be handed to an external vendor rather than handled in-house.

At C-Bay, this conversation typically begins with a **cross-functional assessment** that includes representatives from engineering, product management, finance, and procurement. Together, they review:

- **Business goals and priorities**: Is speed more important than control? Is cost containment more critical than flexibility?
- **Current bottlenecks**: Are integration testing or QA cycles slowing releases?
- **Internal constraints**: Are we lacking specific expertise (e.g., mobile testing automation, legacy system migration)?
- **Resource forecasting**: Can our internal team realistically absorb this workload without burnout or compromise?

Only after this **needs assessment** is complete can the team responsibly say:

“Yes—this is something we should outsource.”

Identifying the Outsourcing Candidates

The next step is to **pinpoint which parts of the project make sense to outsource**. This requires disaggregating the overall scope into manageable units and asking:

- Is this task **repeatable**, **well-defined**, and **independent**?
- Does it require **specialized expertise** not available internally?
- Could outsourcing this allow internal teams to focus on higher-value work?

At C-Bay, common candidates for outsourcing include:

- **Integration testing**
- **User acceptance testing (UAT)**
- **API development or documentation**
- **Performance benchmarking**
- **UX prototyping or front-end refinement**

Each candidate is vetted for **technical risk**, **timeline sensitivity**, **IP exposure**, and **dependency complexity**.

Translating Strategy into a Procurement Plan

Once the outsourcing candidates have been validated, the **procurement strategy** phase formally begins. This is where intent

becomes execution. The goal is to develop a comprehensive **Procurement Plan**—a document that will guide the rest of the solicitation and vendor management lifecycle.

This plan covers four critical components, vendor eligbility criteria, timeline for solicitation, risk management approach, and evaluation methodology.

Vendor Eligibility Criteria

C-Bay defines the minimum requirements a vendor must meet to be considered. This includes:

- Prior experience in similar domains or industries
- Technical certifications (e.g., ISO 9001, SOC2, Agile maturity)
- Geographic considerations (e.g., time zone alignment, language support)
- Legal compliance capabilities (e.g., ability to handle HIPAA, GDPR)
- Financial health and stability

Think of this as the “entrance gate”—no vendor proceeds unless they meet baseline standards.

Timeline for Solicitation

The team maps out a **realistic and enforceable timeline** for each step of the solicitation process, including:

- RFP development and internal approval
- Distribution of the RFP to vendors
- Clarification window and Q&A
- Proposal submission deadline
- Evaluation and scoring
- Shortlist interviews or demos
- Final selection and contract negotiation

This timeline is synchronized with the overall project schedule to ensure the outsourcing process doesn't delay critical path deliverables.

Risk Management Approach

No outsourcing relationship is risk-free. The procurement strategy must include an initial **risk profile** for the work being outsourced, including:

- Operational risks (e.g., missed deadlines, delivery failures)
- Strategic risks (e.g., vendor dependence, loss of flexibility)
- Technical risks (e.g., integration conflicts, toolchain mismatches)
- Compliance risks (e.g., data security breaches, regulatory gaps)

For each risk category, the plan defines **mitigation strategies** (e.g., milestone payments, termination clauses, mandatory security audits).

Evaluation Methodology

Before any proposals arrive, the team agrees on how vendors will be scored.

C-Bay uses a **weighted evaluation matrix** aligned with the Statement of Work (SOW). Criteria may include:

- Technical capability
- Team structure and availability
- Cost realism
- Communication and project management process
- Past client references

The methodology is documented in advance to ensure **objectivity, transparency, and repeatability** in scoring.

Creating the Procurement Plan

All of the above components—eligibility, timeline, risk, evaluation—are synthesized into a formal **Procurement Plan**, which is shared with:

- The internal project team
- The PMO (Program Management Office)
- Legal and compliance
- Relevant business stakeholders

This plan serves as a **reference and accountability document**. It also ensures that everyone involved in selecting and managing vendors is working from the same strategic blueprint.

Procurement begins long before you talk to vendors.

It begins with thoughtful reflection on your project's needs, your internal strengths, and your long-term business priorities. If you skip this stage—or treat it as mere paperwork—you invite confusion, delay, and wasted spend.

But when done well, a strong procurement strategy becomes the **foundation for a partnership that delivers value, quality, and reliability—without surprises**.

This page titled 2.2.2: Step 1 - Procurement Strategy – Laying the Groundwork is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.2.3: Step 2- Establish Requirements – Getting the Documentation Right

Defining Requirements and Expectations

Before any proposal is submitted or bid evaluated, an organization must invest in one critical activity: **clarifying exactly what is needed.** Clear, comprehensive documentation is the backbone of a fair and effective procurement process. It protects both the buyer and the supplier, ensuring that everyone is working from the same assumptions and definitions from day one.

Without clear requirements, vendors are left to guess—leading to inflated estimates, scope confusion, mismatched capabilities, and downstream conflict.

The Goal of Requirements Documentation

Requirements documentation should communicate, in unambiguous terms:

- What the organization expects the vendor to deliver
- What success looks like (quantitatively or qualitatively)
- What constraints, dependencies, and assumptions must be considered
- What standards, tools, or compliance frameworks must be followed

This documentation acts as a reference point for:

- The Request for Proposal (RFP)
- The Statement of Work (SOW)
- Proposal evaluation and scoring
- Contract formation and change management
- Performance monitoring and final acceptance

What to Include in a Requirements Package

The format and content of requirements will vary by industry, but most professional procurement processes include a **tiered structure** of documentation that gradually moves from high-level objectives to detailed specifications. This tiered approach gives vendors time to absorb context before evaluating feasibility or preparing cost estimates.

Business or Operational Requirements

These define the core goals of the project or service being outsourced:

- What problem are we solving?
- What outcome are we trying to achieve?
- What does the organization hope to gain—efficiency, quality, speed, cost savings?

This section should avoid jargon and focus on the needs of internal customers, end users, or stakeholders.

Functional or Service Requirements

These describe what the vendor will actually need to provide:

- The scope of the outsourced work
- Specific tasks, deliverables, and performance criteria
- Interfaces with internal teams or systems (where applicable)

- Any measurement standards (e.g., turnaround times, throughput, accuracy targets)

This is the core of the “what” in the vendor’s scope of work.

Process and Quality Requirements

Here, the focus is on **how** the work will be done and monitored:

- Preferred or required methodologies, tools, materials, or procedures
- Review, approval, or testing protocols
- Quality assurance steps and acceptance thresholds
- Safety, regulatory, or certification requirements
- In regulated industries (e.g., healthcare, aerospace, food production), this section may be extensive and legally binding.

Constraints and Dependencies

This section clarifies any limitations or conditions that will impact the work:

- Project timelines and milestones
- Budget ceilings or procurement caps
- Site access, coordination with third parties, or system availability
- Legal, logistical, or geopolitical constraints
- The goal is to help vendors make **realistic proposals**, not just ideal ones.

Assumptions and Known Risks

Rather than pretending everything is certain, the requirements package should include:

- Known gaps in data or decisions
- Assumed vendor capabilities or resources
- Preliminary risk identification (e.g., seasonal demand spikes, supply chain delays)

When vendors understand the assumptions you’ve made, they can flag red flags early and reduce downstream friction.

Best Practices for Requirements Documentation

- Use plain language and avoid internal-only terms or acronyms
- Share documents in a logical sequence—starting from goals and moving toward details
- Invite clarifying questions from vendors and document the answers
- Update the requirements package promptly if major changes are made during solicitation
- Require vendors to confirm understanding or ask for clarification before submitting proposals

Why This Matters

The vendor selection process is only as good as the information you provide. When vendors bid with incomplete or unclear requirements, the result is uncertainty, buffer-padding, misaligned expectations, or outright project failure.

Clear, structured requirements are the difference between a **collaborative partnership** and a **contract dispute**.

In short, the work of outsourcing doesn’t begin with a proposal or a contract—it begins with **defining what you want, why you want it, and how you’ll know when it’s done well.**

This page titled 2.2.3: Step 2- Establish Requirements – Getting the Documentation Right is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.2.4: Step 3- Statement of Work (SOW) – Defining the Relationship

Defining the Scope of Work

Once the baseline requirements have been gathered and approved, the next critical step in the procurement and outsourcing process is to draft the **Statement of Work (SOW)**. The SOW is not just a supporting document—it is the **contractual core** of the relationship between the organization and the selected vendor.

It translates strategic intent and technical requirements into **explicit commitments** that both parties will refer to throughout the lifecycle of the project or service engagement. It is the document most frequently reviewed during project execution, vendor management, contract enforcement, and post-project evaluation.

The SOW must be detailed, consistent, and written in clear language that minimizes interpretation risk. While it is a legal document, it is also a project management tool and a risk control mechanism.

What the SOW Should Cover

While SOW formats vary by industry, every comprehensive SOW should address the following areas:

Task List and Scope of Responsibilities

The SOW must provide a clear, itemized description of:

- The work the vendor is expected to perform
- The tasks the vendor is *not* responsible for (out-of-scope)
- Who is responsible for each major component of work (vendor, client, third-party)
- How work will be coordinated if multiple vendors are involved

This section ensures that **accountability is unambiguous** and that no essential tasks fall through the cracks.

Example: In a construction project, the SOW might clarify that the vendor is responsible for framing and drywall, but not electrical installation or site security.

Delivery Schedule and Milestones

Time is a core element of every vendor relationship. The SOW must include:

- Project start and end dates
- Major milestones and target dates
- Final delivery date or service completion window
- Internal and external dependencies (e.g., permit approvals, client reviews)

For projects with multiple phases, this section may also specify **intermediate deliverables** tied to payment installments or reviews.

Example: “Phase 2 deliverables must be submitted no later than 30 business days after acceptance of Phase 1.”

Service Level Agreements (SLAs)

SLAs define **performance expectations** in measurable, enforceable terms. Depending on the engagement, this may include:

- Availability and uptime guarantees
- Response and resolution times for issues or requests
- Turnaround times for deliverables
- Escalation procedures and penalties for non-compliance

Each SLA must include:

- A clear metric
- A target threshold
- A method of measurement
- A reporting frequency
- A corrective action plan or penalty structure

Example: “Vendor shall respond to all critical issues within 2 hours and resolve them within 8 hours, 90% of the time, measured monthly.”

Quality Standards and Acceptance Criteria

This section defines how work will be evaluated—and who gets to decide when it’s “done.”

Quality standards may include:

- Industry benchmarks or specifications
- Inspection, testing, or review procedures
- Minimum thresholds for acceptance (e.g., pass rate, defect count, documentation quality)
- Who approves deliverables and by what process

Example: In a training development contract, the SOW might state that all materials must be ADA-compliant and reviewed by the client’s instructional design team.

Risk Assumptions and Shared Responsibilities

No engagement is risk-free. The SOW should acknowledge:

- Known risks at the time of contracting (e.g., supply chain delays, seasonal demand spikes)
- Mitigation strategies
- Which party is responsible for monitoring and responding to each risk
- Any force majeure provisions or insurance coverage required

This section also helps define **what happens when things go wrong**—and who owns the recovery process.

Ownership of Work, IP, and Compliance Obligations

This section is especially critical in engagements involving creative work, intellectual property, software, or regulated deliverables.

It should clearly state:

- Who owns the deliverables
- Whether work-for-hire rules apply
- Whether vendors may reuse code, content, or designs
- How confidential information is protected
- What compliance standards must be met (e.g., HIPAA, GDPR, OSHA)

Example: “All source code produced under this contract shall be the exclusive property of the client, with no reuse or licensing permitted by the vendor.”

Tools, Resources, and Working Conditions

While not always included, many SOWs also specify:

- Software, platforms, or templates to be used
- Where work will be performed (on-site, remote, hybrid)
- What resources the client will provide (e.g., data access, subject matter experts)
- Communication expectations (frequency, format, tools)

Including this information up front can reduce misalignment once work begins.

The SOW is a Living Document—Until It's Signed

The SOW is often revised several times during the vendor engagement process. It may be updated based on:

- Vendor clarification questions during the RFP phase
- Legal team input
- Budget negotiations
- Technical feasibility reviews

But once it is signed, it becomes a **binding agreement**. It is frozen unless modified through a formal change control process.

The goal of a strong SOW is simple: **zero ambiguity at handoff.**

Best Practices for SOW Development

- Involve legal, technical, and project stakeholders early
- Use plain language and avoid industry jargon unless defined
- Include version control and approval history
- Reference other documents (e.g., requirements package) rather than duplicating content
- Validate the SOW with the vendor through a walk-through meeting prior to signature

A well-crafted SOW isn't just a contract—it's a **mutual agreement on expectations, outcomes, and boundaries.** It defines what success looks like, what's required to get there, and how the partnership will be governed along the way.

Done poorly, an SOW becomes a source of conflict.
Done well, it becomes the blueprint for delivery—and a shield against misunderstanding.

This page titled 2.2.4: Step 3- Statement of Work (SOW) – Defining the Relationship is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.2.5: Step 4- Request for Proposal (RFP) – Finding the Right Fit

Soliciting Vendor Proposals

Once the Statement of Work (SOW) has been finalized, reviewed, and approved, the next step in the procurement process is issuing a **Request for Proposal (RFP)**. The RFP is the formal invitation to vendors to submit detailed proposals outlining how they would meet the outlined requirements.

But the RFP isn't just about soliciting quotes—it's about identifying which vendors are strategically aligned, operationally capable, and contractually reliable. It sets the tone for the entire relationship and reflects your organization's priorities, professionalism, and process maturity.

The primary objective of the RFP phase is to **find the right fit**—not just the lowest bid.

What Is an RFP?

An RFP is a structured, comprehensive document that communicates:

- **What you're looking for**
- **Why the work matters**
- **How responses should be structured**
- **How proposals will be evaluated**
- **When and how decisions will be made**

It ensures that all vendors are working from the same playbook—and that internal decision-makers are comparing apples to apples.

Core Components of a Strong RFP

While formats may vary slightly by industry or organization, every RFP should include the following sections:

Background and Context

This section explains who you are, what your organization does, and why the work is being outsourced. It provides essential background so vendors understand the **strategic purpose of the project**, not just the mechanics.

Example: "Our organization is launching a nationwide logistics tracking platform and is seeking vendor support for GPS integration, UI development, and backend testing. This project supports our strategic shift toward contactless delivery."

Project Goals and Deliverables

Here, you describe the **intended outcomes** of the engagement—not just tasks, but results.

This section should answer:

- What problem are we solving?
- What value are we creating?
- What will be considered a successful outcome?

Deliverables should be listed and described in sufficient detail so that vendors can confidently scope their effort and costs.

Scope of Work (Linked to the SOW)

This is the heart of the RFP and should **reference or attach the formal SOW**. Avoid repeating the entire SOW inside the RFP, but summarize key elements such as:

- Key phases and milestones
- Work that is in-scope and out-of-scope
- Tools, platforms, or resources required
- Expectations for collaboration or co-location

Important: If the RFP includes optional or “value-added” work, clearly mark it as such.

Proposal Submission Instructions

Vendors must know exactly **how and when** to submit their proposals.

Include:

- Proposal format (e.g., PDF, online portal, printed copies)
- Page limits or required sections (e.g., Executive Summary, Budget, Team Qualifications)
- Supporting documents (e.g., insurance certificates, work samples)
- Where and to whom the proposal should be sent
- Number of required copies (if physical)

Make sure submission guidelines are **unambiguous and enforceable**. A vague submission process invites confusion and noncompliant responses.

Timeline

This section sets the procurement calendar and manages vendor expectations.

Include dates for:

- RFP release
- Vendor Q&A period
- Final submission deadline
- Proposal evaluation window
- Vendor interviews or demos (if applicable)
- Final selection date
- Project start target

Your timeline must be realistic and aligned with internal decision-making capabilities.

Pro tip: Avoid releasing RFPs during holidays or fiscal year-end crunch periods.

Evaluation Criteria and Weighting

Clarify how proposals will be scored and what matters most to your organization. List the evaluation dimensions and, if possible, assign weightings.

Typical evaluation dimensions include:

- Technical capability and solution design
- Alignment with scope and deliverables
- Project management and staffing model
- Timeline feasibility
- Price and cost structure

- References or relevant past performance
- Risk management and quality control approach

Transparency in evaluation criteria improves fairness, boosts response quality, and protects against procurement bias.

Contact Information and Communication Protocol

Designate a **single point of contact** for all vendor inquiries. Define rules for communication, including whether:

- Vendors may ask clarifying questions
- Answers will be shared publicly
- No-contact rules are in place (e.g., vendors cannot contact internal stakeholders)

This ensures fairness, especially when competitive vendors are involved.

The Vendor Q&A Period – A Crucial Stage

After the RFP is distributed, a **vendor question and answer (Q&A) window** is opened for a defined period (typically 5–10 business days). During this phase:

- Vendors may submit clarification questions regarding the RFP, scope, assumptions, or submission process.
- All questions—and answers—are compiled and distributed to all vendors to **ensure fairness and transparency**.
- If a major revision to the RFP is triggered by a question, a formal **RFP Addendum** may be issued

This phase often reveals whether the SOW was sufficiently clear, or whether assumptions need to be adjusted before bidding concludes.

Best Practices for Managing the RFP Phase

- Use a centralized tracking sheet or portal to manage proposals and communication.
- Schedule an **optional vendor briefing session** to build engagement.
- Document all clarifications and post them in one place.
- Create an internal evaluation team and schedule their availability in advance.
- Enforce deadlines—no exceptions unless the timeline is formally adjusted.

The RFP is the moment where strategy meets the marketplace. It communicates your standards, filters your options, and **initiates what may become a multi-year relationship**.

A strong RFP doesn't just attract vendors. It attracts the **right vendors**—those who are ready to deliver, align with your goals, and thrive under your expectations.

Done right, the RFP becomes more than an invitation. It becomes the first handshake in a successful partnership.

This page titled 2.2.5: Step 4- Request for Proposal (RFP) – Finding the Right Fit is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.2.6: Step 5- Vendor Response Evaluation – More Than Numbers

Evaluating and Selecting Vendors

Once the deadline for proposal submission passes, the procurement process shifts into one of its most critical—and often most misunderstood—phases: **vendor response evaluation**.

This is where organizations move beyond marketing claims, flashy decks, and buzzwords to **rigorously assess** which vendor is truly best suited to deliver the work. It's not simply a question of "Who is the cheapest?" or "Who has the biggest brand name?" It's about **fit, feasibility, and follow-through.**

In well-governed organizations, proposal evaluation is not a gut-level decision. It is a **disciplined, criteria-driven exercise**, conducted by a designated team, using a scoring methodology that was defined *before* proposals were received.

Designing the Evaluation Framework

To ensure consistency, fairness, and defensibility, most organizations develop a **proposal evaluation matrix**—a document that lays out the evaluation criteria and assigns a numerical weight to each category based on its importance to the project.

Here is a sample scoring matrix that could be used across a wide range of procurement types:

Sample Scoring Matrix that could be used across a wide range of procurement types

Evaluation Category	Weight	What It Measures
Technical Fit	30%	How well the proposed solution meets the requirements and aligns with project needs
Cost Realism	20%	Whether the proposed budget is accurate, justified, and sustainable
Project Management Strength	20%	The vendor's ability to plan, coordinate, and execute using repeatable processes
Relevant Experience	15%	Past performance on similar projects in terms of scope, scale, or industry
References and Reputation	10%	Third-party validation of quality, reliability, and service attitude
Presentation & Q&A	5%	Responsiveness, clarity, and depth of understanding during follow-up conversations

Each evaluator scores vendors independently using this matrix, often on a scale of 0–10 per criterion. The score is then weighted and calculated to generate a composite rating.

Note: Evaluation matrices can be adjusted based on project complexity, compliance needs, or industry-specific priorities (e.g., sustainability, localization, certifications).

Independent Evaluation Followed by Consensus

The evaluation process is typically structured in two stages:

1. **Independent Scoring:**
   - Each evaluator (e.g., technical lead, project manager, operations lead) reviews the proposals individually to minimize groupthink or early influence. Evaluators use the SOW, requirements documents, and RFP criteria as their source of truth.
2. **Scoring Consensus Meeting:**
   - Once individual scores are submitted, the evaluation team meets to discuss results, clarify outliers, and align on any inconsistencies. This discussion often reveals:
     - Misinterpretations of the proposal
     - Overlooked risks or inconsistencies
     - Unique strengths that may not have been visible on paper alone

During this meeting, **scores may be adjusted**—but only with documented rationale.

Vendor Interviews, Demos, and Q&A

For short-listed vendors, additional steps may include:

- Live demos or product walkthroughs
- Technical deep dives
- Team introductions and resume verification
- Clarification sessions or resubmission of selected proposal sections

The results of these sessions may impact the “Presentation & Q&A” score or prompt adjustments in the overall matrix.

Final Selection and Governance

The **final decision** is typically made by the **project manager**, with input and approval from:

- The **legal team**, to ensure contract risks are understood
- The **finance team**, to confirm budget alignment and payment terms
- The **PMO (Project Management Office)** or equivalent oversight body, to verify that process integrity was maintained

In certain high-stakes or cross-functional projects, a **Change Control Board (CCB)** or senior procurement committee may review the recommended vendor selection—especially if changes have occurred since the RFP was issued (e.g., budget cuts, revised timelines, updated compliance regulations).

If a non-scoring factor drives a different selection (e.g., emerging legal issue, reputational concern), the CCB has the authority to **override the top-scoring vendor**, but only with justification and documentation.

Best Practices for Transparent Evaluation

- Document the scoring methodology in advance and publish it in the RFP
- Keep proposal copies and evaluator notes archived for auditability
- Use a standardized scoring template to eliminate inconsistency
- Require evaluators to sign a conflict-of-interest disclosure
- Publish summary results internally to demonstrate fairness and accountability

Final Thought

Evaluating vendor proposals is about more than numbers—it’s about **disciplined judgment**. The goal is to find the **right partner**,

not just the lowest bidder. A well-run evaluation process reduces bias, reveals hidden risk, and sets the stage for a strong working relationship from day one.

Remember: a proposal is not a product.
It's a **promise**—and your job is to determine who's most likely to keep it.

This page titled 2.2.6: Step 5- Vendor Response Evaluation – More Than Numbers is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.2.7: Step 6- Contract Negotiation and Signing – Setting Legal Ground Rules

Negotiating and Formalizing the Agreement

Once a preferred vendor has been identified and the evaluation process is complete, the procurement process enters one of its most sensitive and consequential stages: **contract negotiation**.

This is the point where intentions are formalized into enforceable terms, and where the organization's legal, financial, and operational risk must be carefully balanced against delivery expectations. While much of the groundwork has already been laid through the Statement of Work (SOW) and proposal review process, **the legal contract is what ultimately governs the relationship.**

The Role of Legal and Procurement Teams

At this stage, responsibility typically shifts to the **legal and procurement departments**, who take the lead in reviewing, negotiating, and finalizing contract language. However, the project manager and business unit owner remain closely involved to ensure that the contract reflects the **practical realities of the engagement**—not just legal abstractions.

Contract negotiation is a collaborative, multi-stakeholder effort that may include:

- Legal counsel (internal and external)
- Procurement officers
- Finance representatives
- Risk/compliance personnel
- Technical leads or project sponsors
- The vendor's legal and commercial teams

Key Contract Elements to Negotiate and Define

While contract templates may vary, the following components are typically addressed during this phase:

Payment Terms and Invoicing Schedule

This section defines:

- When payments will be made (e.g., upon milestone completion, monthly in arrears, net 30)
- Required documentation for invoicing
- Payment methods (e.g., ACH, wire transfer)
- Conditions for payment holdbacks, bonuses, or penalties

This is closely tied to project milestones and should be aligned with the delivery schedule outlined in the SOW.

Intellectual Property (IP) Ownership and Licensing

This clause governs:

- Who owns the work product created during the engagement
- Whether the vendor retains any usage rights, licenses, or derivative rights
- Restrictions on reusing deliverables or knowledge gained during the engagement
- Whether open-source components or proprietary software will be embedded in the solution

Clarity on IP ownership is critical for organizations in regulated industries, creative fields, or software-intensive projects.

Service-Level Penalties and Performance Remedies

Contracts may include:

- Penalties for missed deadlines, substandard quality, or non-compliance with SLAs
- Incentives or bonuses for early or above-expectation performance
- Liquidated damages for severe or repeated failures
- Provisions for rework, refund, or termination if minimum standards are not met

These clauses help shift risk and ensure accountability beyond reputation alone.

Regulatory and Compliance Obligations

The contract must reflect any **applicable legal or regulatory frameworks**, such as:

- Data protection laws (e.g., GDPR, CCPA)
- Industry-specific compliance requirements (e.g., HIPAA for healthcare, PCI-DSS for payments)
- Export control regulations
- Labor and employment laws for subcontracted labor

This section often requires review by both organizations' compliance teams.

Confidentiality and Data Handling

To protect sensitive information, contracts often include:

- Non-disclosure agreements (NDAs)
- Data classification and encryption requirements
- Limits on data storage, processing, and geographic residency
- Destruction or return of data at contract termination

For cloud-based or data-heavy engagements, these terms may be expanded into a standalone **Data Processing Agreement (DPA).**

Limitation of Liability and Indemnification

These clauses define:

- Caps on financial liability for each party
- Indemnity obligations for IP infringement, data breaches, or third-party claims
- Conditions under which liability may be waived or limited

This section is often negotiated extensively between legal teams.

Termination Rights

Contracts should define:

- Termination for cause (e.g., breach of contract, failure to deliver)
- Termination for convenience (with or without notice)
- Termination penalties or obligations
- Transition support or knowledge transfer upon contract end

Clear termination provisions help avoid disputes and ensure business continuity.

Jurisdiction, Dispute Resolution, and Governing Law

To prepare for potential conflicts, most contracts specify:

- The legal jurisdiction that will govern the contract (e.g., State of California)
- Whether disputes will be handled via arbitration, mediation, or litigation
- Timelines and escalation paths for resolving disputes

This protects both parties by defining a fair and predictable resolution process.

Contract Finalization and Execution

Once all redlines, clarifications, and revisions are resolved, **both parties conduct a final legal review**. No contract should be signed until all stakeholders—including legal, project leadership, finance, and the vendor's commercial team—have formally approved the final version.

The contract is then **executed by authorized signatories**—typically someone with executive authority (e.g., a Chief Operating Officer, Director of Procurement, or equivalent).

All executed copies are archived in a centralized document repository and may be tracked via contract management systems for renewals, amendments, and performance reviews.

A contract is not just a formality. It is a **shared commitment**, backed by legal weight and mutual understanding. It clarifies expectations, defines accountability, and provides the framework through which all future interactions are interpreted.

Done thoughtfully, contract negotiation is not adversarial—it is **collaborative risk management**, setting the stage for a partnership grounded in clarity, trust, and aligned incentives.

This page titled 2.2.7: Step 6- Contract Negotiation and Signing – Setting Legal Ground Rules is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.2.8: Step 7- Monitoring and Control – Staying in the Loop

Monitoring Performance and Managing Delivery

Once the contract is signed and work officially begins, the nature of the project manager's role shifts—but it does not shrink. In fact, this is when **monitoring and control** become central.

While the execution of tasks may be handed off to the vendor, the **responsibility for oversight, coordination, and risk response remains squarely with the client organization.** Effective monitoring ensures that the engagement stays aligned with original goals and agreements—not just in spirit, but in measurable outcomes.

Monitoring is not about micromanagement. It's about maintaining **visibility, control, and trust** throughout the project's life cycle.

Building a Multi-Level Monitoring System

In most structured outsourcing engagements, monitoring is **led by the project manager**, often in partnership with a technical or operational lead. Together, they implement a **multi-layered oversight system** that captures activity across key dimensions: schedule, budget, scope, and quality.

Key components of this system typically include:

Weekly Schedule Tracking

A detailed timeline is only useful if it's actively maintained. Project managers should:

- Compare actual progress against the planned milestone dates
- Track task completion, slippage, and reforecasting
- Identify delays that may impact downstream activities

Project dashboards or Gantt charts should be updated weekly to reflect real progress—not just intentions.

Weekly Budget Analysis

Financial visibility is essential. This includes:

- Budget burn-down reports (how much has been spent vs. planned)
- Invoice reviews and payment milestone confirmations
- Flags for cost overruns, unplanned scope changes, or payment delays

Finance stakeholders should be kept in the loop to ensure timely approvals and proactive corrections.

Bi-Weekly Quality Reviews

Even if work appears to be "on time," it must also be **fit for purpose**. Quality metrics will vary by industry and deliverable, but may include:

- Error or defect tracking (volume, severity, recurrence)
- Testing pass rates or inspection results
- Review of documentation or deliverables against acceptance criteria
- Compliance with performance or service-level agreements

If quality reviews are skipped or delayed, defects may accumulate and compound downstream.

Bi-Weekly Scope Validation

To prevent scope creep or drift, the project team should:

- Reconcile deliverables produced with those committed in the SOW
- Confirm change requests have been formally logged and approved
- Ensure that vendors are not working “ahead” or “off-script” without alignment

Regular scope validation helps protect the project’s focus, cost, and resource plan.

Central Tools for Monitoring

To support this level of oversight, most organizations use a standardized set of documents and tools. These typically include:

- **Project Status Report**
  A concise, visual summary of key metrics: timeline health, budget status, deliverables completed, risks, and upcoming milestones

- **Risk Register**
  A living document used to track identified risks, mitigation plans, impact ratings, and ownership. Updated regularly, this helps the team stay proactive, not reactive.

- **Change Control Log**
  All changes to scope, timeline, or cost must be documented, justified, approved, and logged. This helps maintain transparency and avoid scope disputes.

These tools should be updated on a **consistent cadence** (often weekly or bi-weekly) and shared with all project stakeholders—including internal leadership and vendor representatives as appropriate.

Regular Review Meetings

Monitoring data alone is not enough—it must be interpreted and acted upon. That’s why most project teams hold **weekly or bi-weekly review meetings** with core stakeholders to:

- Present updated reports
- Discuss risks and blockers
- Review recent deliverables
- Decide on change requests or corrective actions
- Re-align on upcoming priorities

These meetings ensure that all parties remain **engaged, informed, and accountable** throughout the life of the contract.

Monitoring and control are not optional—they are essential. They transform a signed contract into a **living, managed relationship**. They ensure that the investment in outsourcing results not only in delivery, but in delivery **with quality, discipline, and alignment.**

The strongest outsourcing relationships are not defined by handoffs—they are defined by **ongoing visibility, consistent dialogue, and shared ownership of results.**

This page titled 2.2.8: Step 7- Monitoring and Control – Staying in the Loop is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.2.9: Deliverables from the Procurement Process

Key Procurement Deliverables

Each phase of a structured procurement and outsourcing process generates a set of critical artifacts—documents and tools that support planning, execution, governance, and evaluation. These deliverables not only provide structure and clarity throughout the vendor engagement but also serve as a **paper trail** for accountability, compliance, and continuous improvement.

Below is a comprehensive overview of the essential deliverables produced from start to finish.

Procurement Strategy Plan

Purpose:
The Procurement Strategy Plan is the foundational document that outlines why outsourcing is being pursued, what will be outsourced, and how the procurement will be conducted.

Key Contents:

- Business goals and outsourcing rationale
- Scope of outsourced work
- Vendor eligibility criteria
- Risk considerations
- Evaluation methodology and timeline

Audience:
Project sponsor, procurement office, legal team, project manager

Request for Proposal (RFP) Package

Purpose:
The RFP package formally invites qualified vendors to submit proposals. It defines the context, expectations, and submission requirements that guide the selection process.

Key Contents:

- Background and project overview
- Goals and deliverables
- Scope of work summary
- Submission instructions and timeline
- Evaluation criteria
- Clarification window guidelines

Audience:
External vendors, project team, procurement office

Finalized Statement of Work (SOW)

Purpose:
The SOW defines the detailed responsibilities, deliverables, milestones, and service levels the vendor will be contractually bound to fulfill. It acts as the operational and legal core of the engagement.

Key Contents:

- Task lists and deliverable descriptions

- Timeline and milestones
- Quality metrics and acceptance criteria
- Risk allocations and assumptions
- Tools, standards, and methods to be used
- IP ownership, data handling, and compliance terms

Audience:
Vendor, project manager, legal team, functional leads

Vendor Scorecard

Purpose:
The vendor scorecard is used to evaluate and compare proposals based on pre-established criteria. It ensures a transparent, defensible, and consistent evaluation process.

Key Contents:

- Weighted scoring matrix (e.g., technical fit, cost realism, PM strength)
- Individual evaluator scores
- Consensus meeting results
- Rationale for selection
- Notes from presentations or demos

Audience:
Evaluation panel, project sponsor, PMO, procurement leadership

Signed Contracts

Purpose:
Signed contracts represent the formal agreement between the client and the vendor. They are legally binding and serve as the final authority for deliverables, terms, and remedies.

Key Contents:

- Master Services Agreement (MSA) or base contract
- Attachments (e.g., SOW, pricing schedule, SLAs)
- Compliance provisions (e.g., data security, confidentiality)
- Payment and invoicing terms
- Dispute resolution and termination clauses
- Signatures and execution dates

Audience:
Vendor legal/commercial team, client legal, finance, and PMO

Weekly Status Reports

Purpose:
Status reports maintain project visibility. They capture progress, highlight risks, and provide a shared view of what's done, what's in motion, and what's behind.

Key Contents:

- Work completed this period
- Work planned for next period
- Risks, issues, and dependencies
- Budget status and milestone tracking
- Action items and responsible parties

Audience:
Project team, vendor team, stakeholders, steering committee

Change Logs

Purpose:
Change logs formally document any modifications to scope, timeline, or cost. They protect against scope creep and ensure accountability for every decision that alters the original agreement.

Key Contents:

- Description of change
- Rationale and impact analysis
- Approval workflow and sign-off
- Updated schedule or budget references
- Version control

Audience:
Project manager, PMO, vendor, legal or contract administrator

Risk Register

Purpose:
The risk register is a living document used to identify, assess, track, and respond to risks over the life of the engagement.

Key Contents:

- Risk description and category (technical, operational, financial, etc.)
- Probability and impact assessment
- Mitigation strategies
- Owner/responsible party
- Status (open, mitigated, escalated, closed)

Audience:
Project team, risk manager, vendor, executive sponsor

Project Closure Report

Purpose:
The closure report formally concludes the engagement. It documents what was delivered, how it was evaluated, what was learned, and what should be done differently in the future.

Key Contents:

- Summary of deliverables and outcomes
- Final budget and schedule reconciliation
- Vendor performance evaluation
- Lessons learned and postmortem analysis
- Contract close-out checklist and archive index
- Recommendations for future engagements

Audience:
Project sponsor, PMO, procurement office, future project teams

Each of these deliverables plays a vital role—not just in executing a vendor engagement, but in maintaining transparency, accountability, and organizational learning. When these documents are developed thoughtfully and maintained consistently, they form the **institutional memory of how outsourcing works—and how to make it work better.**

This page titled 2.2.9: Deliverables from the Procurement Process is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.2.10: Final Thoughts- The Project Manager's Role in Procurement

The Project Manager's Procurement Playbook

Procurement is often misunderstood as a transactional function—an administrative step that happens in the background, isolated from the "real" project work. But for a project manager (PM), procurement is not an afterthought. It is a **strategic, cross-functional process** that sets the foundation for delivery, accountability, and success.

The best project managers approach procurement not as shoppers or facilitators—but as **system designers** and **relationship architects**. Their job is to translate business needs into clear expectations, match those expectations to the right partners, and create the structure that enables both sides to succeed.

Here are four core truths every PM must internalize about their role in the procurement process.

Think Strategically About What Should Be Outsourced

Not every task should be handed to a vendor. And not every internal team should own every deliverable.
One of the project manager's most important strategic decisions is to **determine what work is best performed externally**—and why.

This means evaluating:

- What's core to the organization's value proposition—and what's not
- Where internal teams are strongest—and where they're stretched or misaligned
- What external providers can do faster, better, or more cost-effectively
- Where outsourcing creates risk—and how that risk can be mitigated through design

This decision cannot be made in isolation. It must be informed by business goals, timelines, cost structures, and talent availability. The PM serves as the **bridge** between strategy and execution—ensuring that outsourced work is scoped appropriately, justified clearly, and integrated seamlessly into the broader project architecture.

Create Clear, Consistent Documentation That Aligns All Stakeholders

Procurement fails not because of bad vendors—but because of **vague expectations, misaligned assumptions, and inconsistent messaging.**

The project manager is the custodian of clarity. From the Statement of Work to the RFP, from status reports to change requests, the PM is responsible for ensuring that:

- Requirements are well-defined and traceable
- Documentation is consistent across stakeholders and systems
- Changes are recorded, explained, and approved
- The vendor and internal teams are always operating from the same source of truth

Good documentation does more than protect the organization—it **enables performance**, by ensuring that every contributor knows what's expected, what success looks like, and how to deliver it.

Manage Risk—Don't Avoid It

Outsourcing introduces uncertainty. Timelines shift. Vendors misinterpret specifications. Deliverables arrive with gaps. These are not signs of failure—they are **predictable realities** in a complex project.

The PM's job is not to prevent risk. It is to **anticipate, manage, and respond to it with discipline**.

This means:

- Identifying risks early and documenting them in a living risk register
- Collaborating with vendors on contingency planning
- Monitoring quality and schedule deviations in real time
- Leading escalation conversations constructively—not reactively

By managing risk proactively, the PM earns trust, keeps stakeholders aligned, and prevents small issues from becoming costly delays or breakdowns.

Own the Outcomes—Not Just the Contracts

While legal teams negotiate the contract, and procurement may facilitate the vendor process, it is the **project manager who owns the outcomes**.

That means:

- Ensuring that vendor deliverables meet the business need—not just the contractual language
- Holding both the internal team and the vendor accountable to agreed-upon goals
- Tracking performance, raising red flags, and enforcing SLAs where needed
- Closing the project with a structured evaluation, documentation archive, and retrospective

Ownership doesn't mean doing the work yourself. It means **orchestrating the work so that it gets done right—on time, on budget, and on purpose.**

From the moment procurement begins, the project manager is a **translator, negotiator, facilitator, and leader.** Your role is to bring structure to ambiguity, discipline to delivery, and clarity to every relationship in the vendor ecosystem.

Done well, procurement is not a detour—it's the on-ramp to success.

From day one to closeout, your job is to make sure that:

- The vendor knows what to deliver
- Your team knows how to support it
- Stakeholders know what to expect
- And everyone involved knows exactly how success will be measured

That's not just good procurement. That's **professional project management**.

This page titled 2.2.10: Final Thoughts- The Project Manager's Role in Procurement is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.2.11: Step 8- Contract Management and Closure – Delivering and Wrapping Up

Closing the Engagement and Capturing Lessons Learned

A successful outsourcing engagement doesn't end with the final deliverable. Instead, it concludes with a **structured, deliberate closeout process**—one that ensures work has been completed to standard, responsibilities have been fulfilled, lessons have been captured, and the relationship is either closed or ready to evolve.

Whether a project ends as scheduled, finishes early, or is terminated midstream, formal closure is essential to maintaining professional standards, protecting the organization's interests, and preparing for future vendor engagements.

Key Activities in the Closure Process

The contract management and closeout phase typically includes the following tasks:

Final Acceptance and Deliverable Verification

Before a project can be considered complete, the client must confirm that all deliverables:

- Have been submitted in full
- Meet the specifications outlined in the Statement of Work (SOW)
- Have passed any required inspection, testing, or stakeholder review processes

This is formalized through an **acceptance sign-off**, which may include approval memos, quality checklists, or testing certifications.

Final Payment and Financial Settlement

Once acceptance is confirmed:

- Final invoices are reviewed and reconciled against payment milestones
- Any holdbacks, penalties, or bonuses are calculated
- Outstanding expenses, taxes, or reimbursements are addressed

Finance must approve the release of final payment and close the purchase order or contract in the system of record.

Vendor Performance Evaluation

To inform future sourcing decisions, the vendor's performance should be evaluated across key dimensions:

- Timeliness and delivery adherence
- Communication and responsiveness
- Technical or service quality
- Change management and issue resolution
- Professionalism and accountability

This evaluation is typically documented using a **vendor scorecard** or post-project rating form and shared with procurement leadership.

Documentation Archival

All relevant documentation must be gathered, reviewed, and securely archived. This may include:

- The final, signed contract and amendments
- SOW, RFP, and proposal submissions
- Status reports, change logs, and meeting notes
- Final deliverables and review findings
- Quality and risk reports

Document retention policies will vary by organization and industry, but archival ensures traceability and audit readiness.

Lessons Learned and Postmortem Review

A structured **retrospective** is conducted with both internal stakeholders and, in some cases, the vendor team. This session should cover:

- What went well
- What challenges arose and how they were resolved
- What process improvements are recommended
- Any risks or dependencies to watch for in future work

These insights should be documented and shared across project management, procurement, and business teams.

Contract Closure and Offboarding

Finally:

- Access credentials are revoked
- Shared workspaces or collaboration tools are decommissioned
- Data handoff or secure destruction is confirmed
- A formal **closure memo** is circulated to signal completion

Only after these steps are completed is the vendor **eligible for future opportunities**. This protects the organization's vendor ecosystem and maintains sourcing discipline.

Governance and Role Responsibilities

Contract closure is a cross-functional activity involving multiple stakeholders. Below is a sample role map:

Key stakeholder responsibilities during project closeout, acceptance, governance, and contract completion.

Role	Responsibility
Project Manager	Oversees execution and leads closure coordination
Functional Lead / Dev Manager	Ensures quality, tests, and technical sign-off
PMO or Procurement Office	Verifies compliance with process, policy, and documentation
Business Sponsor / Customer	Signs off on final product acceptance

Role	Responsibility
Steering Committee	Provides executive-level oversight and guidance
Chief Operating Officer (COO)	Approves contract closure, signs final documents if needed

Sample Procurement Timeline (For Reference)

Illustrative procurement timeline showing key milestones from RFP issuance through vendor selection, project execution, and closeout.

Milestone	Date
RFP Distribution	June 7, 2024
Proposals Due	June 28, 2024
Vendor Selection	July 9, 2024
Project Start	July 12, 2024
Project Closeout Begins	September 30, 2024

This timeline reflects a best-case, streamlined scenario. Projects of greater complexity or regulatory oversight may extend the closure phase further.

Closure is not just a box-checking exercise—it's a **moment of truth**. It reflects whether the procurement process worked as designed, whether the vendor delivered as promised, and whether the organization is now in a stronger position because of the engagement.

A disciplined closure process turns one project into many lessons—and ensures that **every outsourcing experience strengthens the next.**

This page titled 2.2.11: Step 8- Contract Management and Closure – Delivering and Wrapping Up is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.3: Case Study

Context

This case study guides you through the full outsourcing planning process for the Reckon Project. From exploring options and making strategic decisions to completing analyses like SWOT, Make-or-Buy, and risk planning, you'll build real-world skills. Final deliverables include polished documentation, team reflections, and a submission-ready professional outsourcing plan.

This page titled 2.3: Case Study is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.3.1: Planning for Outsourcing

Introduction to Milestone 1: Planning for Outsourcing

Every successful outsourcing engagement begins long before a contract is signed or a vendor is selected. It begins with a question: **What are we trying to accomplish—and what's the smartest way to get there?** This milestone invites you to answer that question by stepping into the role of a project leader tasked with planning an outsourcing strategy for a high-impact initiative.

In this practicum, you've just been assigned to help C-Bay Inc. navigate a major resourcing challenge. Their IT department is in the midst of a massive expansion, yet they are already overwhelmed with maintenance demands. A critical project—Reckon—has stalled. To get it back on track, the Director of IT is asking for your help to assess whether outsourcing could be a viable solution. But outsourcing isn't a shortcut. It is a **strategic decision** that requires careful evaluation of internal constraints, external opportunities, contractual structure, supplier fit, and risk exposure.

This milestone is where you develop that strategy.

You will begin by analyzing C-Bay's current position using a SWOT framework to determine whether outsourcing is justified. You'll then break down the Reckon project into components, deciding what should be handled internally versus externally. From there, you'll evaluate contract models, develop a supplier selection plan, and build a risk register that reflects the realities of offshoring in today's complex business landscape.

Throughout this process, you'll apply real tools—make-or-buy analysis, procurement planning worksheets, and contract evaluation tables—while practicing real leadership behaviors: facilitating team decision-making, presenting clear justifications, and anticipating stakeholder concerns. You will not be told what to do. You must design a plan that makes sense—and defend it with clarity and confidence.

The goal of Milestone 1 is not to produce a perfect answer, but to engage in **professional-level planning** that mirrors what managers and consultants are asked to do every day: solve for ambiguity, make hard tradeoffs, and deliver a recommendation that moves the organization forward.

This is your first step in becoming that kind of leader. Let's begin.

Introduction and Orientation

Before any contract is signed, before any vendor is evaluated, and before a single dollar is spent—**there must be a plan**.

Welcome to your first milestone in this practicum: **Planning for Outsourcing**. In this stage, you will step into the role of a project leader preparing to decide what should (and should not) be outsourced within a larger organizational initiative. You'll be given a scenario that mirrors real-world complexity—ambitious goals, limited internal resources, tight timelines, and competing priorities. Your job is to bring structure to that ambiguity and prepare your organization for an informed, disciplined outsourcing decision.

This milestone is not about choosing a vendor. It's about asking—and answering—the most critical strategic questions before the procurement process even begins:

- What work should we keep in-house?
- What should we consider handing off?
- What risks, dependencies, and constraints must we account for?
- And what does success look like when we don't own the work directly?

What You'll Do in This Milestone

You will receive an **Outsourcing Brief**, which lays out a realistic business scenario involving competing internal demands and unclear boundaries. Based on this challenge, your team will:

1. Analyze what work might be suitable for outsourcing
2. Apply structured frameworks like **make-or-buy analysis** and **outsourcing decision trees**
3. Use project management principles (e.g., PMBOK sourcing strategies) to assess risk, cost, and complexity
4. Build an initial **Procurement Strategy Plan** and **Make-or-Buy Worksheet**
5. Reflect on your approach, tradeoffs, and decision-making process

This milestone provides the thinking framework for everything that comes after. Just like in real project work, a weak planning phase leads to downstream confusion, cost overruns, and missed opportunities. A strong one builds confidence, alignment, and clarity—for you, your team, and your future vendor.

What You'll Use

To support your work, you'll receive:

- A **Procurement Planning Worksheet** to guide your decision-making
- A **Make-or-Buy Analysis Template** for visualizing tradeoffs
- Learning resources on sourcing strategies, stakeholder alignment, and PM frameworks
- Examples of common pitfalls and how to avoid them
- A detailed rubric so you know how your work will be evaluated
- A checklist to ensure your submission is complete and professional

Optional: Quizzes or Canvas-based knowledge checks may be assigned to reinforce concepts.

How You'll Be Graded

Your performance in this milestone will be evaluated not just on the correctness of your analysis, but on:

- **Clarity of thinking**
- **Strategic alignment with the scenario**
- **Use of tools and frameworks**
- **Professionalism of deliverables**
- **Depth of reflection in your post-analysis**

The rubric is designed to reward **rigor, structure, and thoughtful decision-making**, not perfection. You're not expected to get everything "right"—you're expected to think like a project professional.

Why This Matters

Planning is where leaders are made. It's where assumptions are challenged, blind spots are surfaced, and priorities are clarified. In the real world, strong outsourcing decisions don't start with vendor names. They start with hard questions and honest answers.

This milestone is your chance to practice asking those questions. Your deliverables will shape how your organization approaches vendors, scopes work, mitigates risk, and defines success in every milestone that follows

This page titled 2.3.1: Planning for Outsourcing is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.3.2: Initiation- Exploring Outsourcing Options for the Reckon Project

Outsourcing Assessment for the Reckon Project

From: Director of IT, C-Bay Inc.
To: Project Management Team

Dear Team,

As we prepare for a significant organizational expansion, our department is entering a critical transition period. Over the next six months, the IT division will grow from a staff of 36 to more than 170 team members. During this interim, however, our current capacity is fully consumed by maintaining legacy systems and ongoing support operations.

As a result, we are unable to allocate internal resources to advance the **Reckon project**—a strategic initiative that is central to C-Bay Inc.'s growth trajectory. While the **Reckon Project Plan** (attached) includes timelines and cost estimates for internal execution, the project has already experienced delays due to competing business priorities. We are at risk of falling further behind if corrective action is not taken now.

To mitigate future setbacks, I would like to explore **strategic outsourcing** as a means to accelerate delivery and ensure the highest possible quality. Outsourcing could allow us to:

- Access specialized expertise not currently available in-house
- Compress development timelines
- Retain internal focus on mission-critical system support

That said, outsourcing also introduces new variables in cost, control, and risk. I'm seeking your input on how we should move forward.

Your Assignment:

Please review the attached Reckon Project Plan in detail and prepare a written recommendation that addresses the following:

- **Feasibility Assessment:**
  Which components of the project could be suitable for outsourcing based on scope, complexity, and integration risk?

- **Benefit/Risk Analysis:**
  What are the potential advantages and disadvantages of outsourcing specific portions of the project?

- **Cost Comparison:**
  Compare internal development estimates with a preliminary cost model for outsourcing. Identify assumptions made.

- **Recommendations:**
  Based on your analysis, outline a recommended approach to initiating outsourcing, including any additional information you would require to proceed (e.g., vendor qualifications, timeline adjustments, legal or IP considerations).

Please ensure your response is strategic, structured, and supported by data or decision frameworks where applicable. This document will guide the next phase of resourcing and procurement for the Reckon initiative.

I look forward to reviewing your insights and collaborating on a high-impact solution.

Best regards,
[Director of IT]
C-Bay Inc

This page titled 2.3.2: Initiation- Exploring Outsourcing Options for the Reckon Project is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.3.3: Plan of Attack- Making the Case for Smart Outsourcing

Assessing Outsourcing Opportunities

In *Plan of Attack: Making the Case for Smart Outsourcing*, you'll take on the role of a strategic advisor tasked with recommending whether—and how—to outsource components of a stalled, high-stakes project. This section challenges you to go beyond instinct or cost alone and develop a well-reasoned, evidence-based outsourcing proposal. You'll analyze the Reckon Project's needs, assess internal constraints, and weigh the benefits and risks of outsourcing key workstreams. Using structured frameworks like make-or-buy analysis, cost modeling, and stakeholder alignment, you'll learn to think like a consultant: balancing agility, quality, and control. The goal isn't just to choose outsourcing, but to justify it clearly and credibly to leadership. Whether presenting to an executive or preparing for procurement, your plan must be rigorous, realistic, and aligned with the organization's broader goals. By the end, you'll have built not just a case—but the confidence to defend it.

This page titled 2.3.3: Plan of Attack- Making the Case for Smart Outsourcing is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.3.4: Planning for Outsourcing – Student Workbook

Plan of Attack: Making the Case for Smart Outsourcing

Setting the Stage

In a recent conversation with the Chief Operating Officer (COO) of a midsize tech company, I learned about a project that had veered off course—not because the product lacked value, but because the **strategy behind its outsourcing decision was incomplete.** The leadership team had decided to outsource the development of a core product, largely because they needed to demonstrate progress to investors. The logic seemed simple: external development meant lower cost and faster results.

To execute this plan, the company hired four U.S.-based software architects and engaged a development team in India. But there was a critical flaw: **no one was assigned to manage the offshore team.** The architects wanted to focus on design—not coordination. Communication broke down. Deliverables lagged. The project burned resources without building momentum. The company had "outsourced" development, but **not responsibility, not planning, and not leadership.**

This is a cautionary tale—one that's all too common in organizations that see outsourcing as a budget solution rather than a **strategic capability**.

Why This Exercise Matters

Before you can make recommendations on how to outsource a project, you must be able to answer five essential questions:

1. Why outsource at all?
2. What should be outsourced—and what should remain in-house?
3. How do we select the right supplier?
4. How should we structure the engagement (contract, communication, oversight)?
5. How do we manage the risks of offshoring—especially when it comes to quality, IP, and coordination?

In this milestone, your job is to **guide leadership toward better outsourcing decisions**—grounded in data, analysis, and professional project management practices.

Objectives for This Task

As a team, you will:

1. Explain the **strategic justification** for outsourcing portions of the Reckon project
2. Apply the **outsourcing lifecycle** to structure a sound outsourcing plan
3. Draft a **Statement of Work (SOW)** to define the outsourced scope and expectations
4. Design a **supplier selection process**, including criteria and due diligence
5. Identify the **risks associated with offshoring** and present mitigation strategies

Your final product will be a clear, persuasive **Outsourcing Recommendation** for the executive team.

Step-by-Step Guide

Use the following structure to develop your deliverable:

Step 1: Justify the Decision to Outsource

Your first responsibility is to articulate *why* outsourcing makes sense for the Reckon project—based on internal constraints, external opportunities, and the project's strategic importance.

Use a **SWOT analysis** to frame your argument:

- What strengths or opportunities make outsourcing feasible or advantageous?
- What weaknesses or threats make internal development problematic?
- How does outsourcing align with C-Bay's broader goals?

Tip: Use one of the provided SWOT templates to organize your analysis. Anchor your reasoning in real constraints (e.g., staffing capacity, timelines, technology stack limitations).

Step 2: Identify What Should Be Outsourced (and What Shouldn't)

Review the full project plan for Reckon. Break down the work into logical components or phases.

Then:

- Determine which components are **strong candidates for outsourcing** (e.g., front-end development, testing, legacy migration)
- Identify which elements must be **kept in-house** (e.g., system architecture, data governance, product strategy)
- Justify each decision based on complexity, risk, integration sensitivity, and internal capacity

Also describe **what resources and roles** are required internally to manage the outsourced components effectively.

Tip: Look for embedded assumptions in the original project plan. Challenge or validate them using your independent analysis.

Step 3: Recommend a Contract Type

Evaluate the different types of outsourcing contracts available:

- **Fixed-price contracts**
- **Time-and-materials (T&M) contracts**
- **Cost-plus contracts**
- **Performance-based contracts**

For each, explain:

- Pros and cons in the context of the Reckon project
- Level of flexibility vs. control
- Risk exposure for both parties

Then **recommend the best-fit contract type** and explain your rationale.

Tip: Consider the maturity of the vendor, clarity of scope, and C-Bay's risk tolerance when choosing a contract model.

Step 4: Design a Supplier Selection Process

Develop a plan to identify, evaluate, and select the most qualified vendor.

Your plan should include:

- A clear **supplier selection criteria list** (technical expertise, delivery history, pricing, etc.)
- A step-by-step **evaluation process** (e.g., RFP → Proposal Review → Interview → Reference Check)
- Guidance on **vendor due diligence** (financial stability, past performance, ethical sourcing, data security readiness)

Tip: Reference the article on supplier due diligence to guide your approach.

Step 5: Identify and Manage Risks

Outsourcing and offshoring introduce a unique set of risks. Your recommendation should name at least 3–5 **specific risks** that could impact delivery, quality, or compliance.

For each risk:

- Describe the nature of the risk (e.g., IP leakage, delivery delays, communication failures)
- Assess the likelihood and impact
- Propose mitigation or management strategies

Tip: Review the ACM Job Migration Task Force report (Chapter 6) to understand the structural risks involved in global outsourcing.

What You Will Submit

Your team will prepare a **formal Outsourcing Recommendation Document**, which includes:

- SWOT Analysis Summary
- Make-or-Buy Rationale
- Outsourced Scope with Justification
- Contract Type Recommendation
- Supplier Selection Criteria and Evaluation Plan
- Risk Register and Mitigation Plan
- Supporting appendices (e.g., worksheets, visual frameworks, key assumptions)

You'll also prepare a short **presentation** of your findings and recommendations for peer and instructor feedback.

Outsourcing is not a shortcut. It's a strategic move that must be justified, structured, and governed. In this milestone, you'll learn how to take a vague directive ("let's outsource it") and turn it into a **professional-grade plan** grounded in project management principles and stakeholder value.

Approach it like a consultant. Think like a strategist. Write like a leader.

This page titled 2.3.4: Planning for Outsourcing – Student Workbook is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.3.4.1: SWOT Analysis for Outsourcing Justification

Milestone 1 Planning Workbook

Section Overview

In this section, you will conduct a SWOT Analysis to evaluate whether outsourcing is a strategically sound choice for the Reckon project. A SWOT Analysis helps project leaders assess the internal and external factors that can influence the success of a major decision—in this case, the decision to outsource.

You will use this SWOT Analysis Template to evaluate C-Bay Inc.'s current strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats related to outsourcing and vendor engagement.

Learning Objectives

By completing this section, you will be able to:

- Use a SWOT Analysis to guide strategic outsourcing decisions
- Identify internal capacity and capability gaps
- Examine external market and vendor factors
- Prepare a foundation for a recommendation on outsourcing scope and structure

Instructions

Follow the steps below to complete your analysis.

Step 1: Review the Context

Begin by reviewing the Reckon Project Plan and the Outsourcing Brief. As you read, take note of:

- Team size and skill availability
- Time constraints and competing priorities
- Project complexity and timeline pressures
- Any internal or external expectations for performance or delivery

These notes will help inform your analysis.

Step 2: Complete the SWOT Table

Use the structure below to identify at least three to four bullet points in each category. Your goal is to map out C-Bay's current positioning as it relates to outsourcing the Reckon project.

Strengths (Internal advantages)

- What does C-Bay already do well?
- What in-house capabilities or tools already exist?
- Are there any internal processes that support successful delivery?

Weaknesses (Internal limitations)

- What capacity or skills are currently missing?
- What past project delays or missteps have occurred?

- Where are the team's operational blind spots?

Opportunities (External possibilities)

- Are there vendors who could improve quality or speed?
- Can outsourcing help reduce overhead or scale more efficiently?
- Could outsourcing help meet investor or market pressure?

Threats (External risks and obstacles)

- What could go wrong with outsourcing or offshoring?
- Are there data, IP, or compliance concerns?
- Could vendor underperformance jeopardize the project?

Record your answers in a table or bulleted format.

Step 3: Write a Summary

After completing the SWOT table, write a short paragraph (five to seven sentences) that summarizes your observations. This should include:

- Key strengths that could support internal development
- Weaknesses that outsourcing might help mitigate
- Opportunities that outsourcing presents for the project
- Threats that would need to be carefully managed

Your summary does not need to take a final position on whether to outsource. Instead, it should frame the strategic landscape that your team will explore in more depth in later sections.

Tips and Guidance

- Focus on evidence from the project plan, not assumptions.
- Discuss each quadrant as a team before finalizing your entries.
- Keep internal factors (strengths and weaknesses) separate from external ones (opportunities and threats).
- Be honest—identifying weaknesses or threats is not a sign of failure; it is a sign of responsible planning.

Deliverable

Each team must submit:

- A completed SWOT table with at least three bullet points in each category
- A written summary that synthesizes the analysis

These will serve as the foundation for your make-or-buy decision and outsourcing recommendation.

This page titled 2.3.4.1: SWOT Analysis for Outsourcing Justification is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.3.4.2: Make-or-Buy Analysis

Defining the Outsourcing Boundary

Section Overview

Now that you have completed your SWOT analysis, the next step is to decide which parts of the Reckon project should be completed in-house and which may be suitable for outsourcing. This is known as a make-or-buy decision.

A make-or-buy analysis is a structured approach to evaluating whether the organization should internally "make" (develop, manage, or build) a component or "buy" (outsource) it from an external vendor. This decision is based on factors such as cost, capability, risk, speed, and strategic value.

The results of this section will directly influence your scope planning, vendor selection, and contract structure later in the project.

Learning Objectives

By completing this section, you will be able to:

- Break down a complex project into distinct work components
- Evaluate each component for outsourcing potential
- Justify in-house versus outsourced decisions with clear rationale
- Prepare for detailed vendor scoping and SOW development in later phases

Instructions

Follow the steps below to complete your analysis.

Step 1: Review the Reckon Project Plan

Carefully examine the project plan provided for the Reckon initiative. Pay particular attention to the task breakdown, timelines, estimated resource needs, and skill requirements. Ask yourself:

- Which components are clearly defined and modular?
- Which components require integration with internal systems or proprietary knowledge?
- Which tasks are time-sensitive or skill-intensive?
- Where are the team's internal limitations?

Make notes in your team folder as you work through these questions.

Step 2: Identify Work Components

List the major components, phases, or deliverables of the project. Depending on how the project is structured, these might include items such as:

- Business analysis and requirements gathering
- UI/UX design
- Front-end development
- Back-end integration
- API or middleware development
- Testing and quality assurance

- Documentation and training

If the project involves physical deliverables or services, define components relevant to that domain.

Step 3: Complete the Make-or-Buy Table

Use the following format to evaluate each component.

Evaluate each project component to determine whether it is best performed internally or outsourced.

Work Component	Make In-House or Buy (Outsource)?	Rationale
Example: UI Design	Buy	Requires fast turnaround and external creative expertise
Example: Database Architecture	Make	Involves secure access to internal systems and legacy integration

Your rationale should reflect both strategic considerations (e.g., IP sensitivity, risk) and operational realities (e.g., lack of staff, urgency, cost efficiency).

Aim to complete this table for at least six to eight key project components.

Step 4: Write a Summary

Write a short paragraph (five to seven sentences) summarizing your overall outsourcing boundary. This should include:

- What work you recommend outsourcing and why
- What work must stay in-house and why
- Any special requirements or assumptions that influenced your decision
- How this allocation will impact project coordination and oversight

This summary will help you frame your outsourcing scope in the Statement of Work and your supplier selection strategy later in the milestone.

Tips and Guidance

- Don’t default to outsourcing everything or nothing. Focus on fit.
- Consider how easily a task can be defined, handed off, tested, and measured.
- Think about how dependencies between tasks will be managed.
- Consult your SWOT analysis to revisit capacity, risks, and resource gaps.
- If your team is unsure, start by outsourcing low-risk, non-core components and scale outward from there.

Deliverable

Each team must submit:

- A completed Make-or-Buy Table with rationale for each decision
- A written summary describing your overall sourcing boundary and decision logic

This will form the basis of your Statement of Work and will inform your contract and risk planning.

This page titled 2.3.4.2: Make-or-Buy Analysis is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.3.4.3: Contract Type Evaluation

Selecting the Right Contract Structure

Section Overview

Once you have identified which portions of the Reckon project should be outsourced, the next step is to determine how to structure the engagement from a contractual standpoint. Choosing the right contract type is a critical decision. It directly affects cost predictability, risk sharing, flexibility, and how success is measured.

There is no one-size-fits-all approach. The contract type you recommend must reflect the nature of the outsourced work, the clarity of requirements, and the risk tolerance of the organization.

Learning Objectives

By completing this section, you will be able to:

- Describe the major types of outsourcing contracts and how they differ
- Evaluate the pros and cons of each option in context
- Recommend a contract type appropriate to C-Bay's situation
- Justify your choice with reference to project scope, vendor maturity, and risk allocation

Instructions

Follow the steps below to analyze and recommend a contract structure.

Step 1: Review the Work You Plan to Outsource

Return to your Make-or-Buy Table. Focus on the components you have identified for outsourcing. Ask:

- Are the requirements well-defined and stable, or still evolving?
- Are the deliverables discrete and measurable, or open-ended and iterative?
- How important is cost certainty vs. flexibility?
- What is the organization's risk tolerance if the vendor underperforms?

These factors will shape your contract recommendation.

Step 2: Understand the Major Contract Types

Read the provided resource on contract types, then summarize the characteristics of each in the table below.

Compare contract types to determine which pricing and risk structure best fits the project's scope, uncertainty, and oversight needs.

Contract Type	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages	Use Case Fit (Yes/No)
Fixed-Price	Vendor delivers a defined scope for a fixed fee	Predictable cost, low oversight	Low flexibility, vendor may cut corners	

Contract Type	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages	Use Case Fit (Yes/No)
Time-and-Materials (T&M)	Vendor charges based on hours worked and materials used	Flexible, good for evolving scope	Less cost control, higher oversight required	
Cost-Plus	Vendor is reimbursed for costs plus a fixed fee or incentive	Transparent pricing, shared risk	Complex to manage, not ideal for tight budgets	
Performance-Based	Vendor is paid based on achievement of specific results	Aligns incentives with outcomes	Requires strong metrics and monitoring	

Complete the table with your team. Indicate whether each contract type could work for the Reckon project and why.

Step 3: Make Your Recommendation

Based on your evaluation, select the contract type that best fits the outsourcing scope and project needs. In one paragraph, answer:

- Which contract type do you recommend and why?
- How does it align with C-Bay's timeline, budget, and risk profile?
- What trade-offs are you making by choosing this structure?

Your answer should demonstrate professional reasoning, not just preference.

Tips and Guidance

- Fixed-price contracts work well when the scope is clear and stable.
- T&M contracts offer flexibility but require strong vendor management and tracking.
- Cost-plus contracts are more common in long-term partnerships or R&D projects.
- Performance-based models require reliable metrics and tight alignment between parties.
- Consider hybrid models if different components require different levels of control and flexibility.

Deliverable

Each team must submit:

- A completed Contract Evaluation Table with use-case notes
- A written recommendation paragraph with justification

This section will be referenced in your Statement of Work and during vendor negotiations.

This page titled 2.3.4.3: Contract Type Evaluation is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.3.4.4: Supplier Selection Plan

Developing a Supplier Section Strategy

Section Overview

Once you've defined what will be outsourced and how the contract will be structured, the next step is to develop a fair and rigorous process to identify and select the right supplier. Choosing the right vendor is not just about finding someone who can do the work—it's about finding a partner who can do the work well, on time, and in alignment with your organization's values, risks, and standards.

A strong supplier selection process is structured, criteria-driven, and transparent. It avoids vague decision-making and builds stakeholder confidence in the vendor relationship from the very beginning.

Learning Objectives

By completing this section, you will be able to:

- Develop weighted criteria for evaluating vendor proposals
- Design a repeatable supplier evaluation and selection process
- Identify what due diligence steps are appropriate and necessary
- Prepare to score and defend your vendor recommendation in later milestones

Instructions

Follow the steps below to complete your supplier selection plan.

Step 1: Define Your Selection Criteria

As a team, brainstorm what qualities you are looking for in a vendor. Choose five to seven criteria that are most important for the success of the outsourced components of the Reckon project.

Common criteria include:

- Technical expertise or industry specialization
- Past performance on similar projects
- Pricing and cost realism
- Timeline and delivery capacity
- Communication practices and cultural compatibility
- Data security and regulatory compliance readiness
- Scalability and resource availability

Write your final criteria in the table below.

Evaluate and prioritize the criteria that will be used to compare vendors and support an objective selection decision.

Selection Criterion	Weight (1–5)	Why This Matters

Selection Criterion	Weight (1–5)	Why This Matters

Each weight should reflect the **relative importance** of the criterion to your project. For example, if delivery speed is more important than price, it should receive a higher weight.

Step 2: Outline the Selection Process

Describe the step-by-step process you will use to evaluate vendors. This may include:

- RFP distribution
- Vendor Q&A period
- Proposal submission deadline
- Proposal scoring using your criteria
- Finalist interviews or demos
- Reference checks
- Final decision and contract negotiation

Write your process as a numbered list or timeline. Be specific about who will be involved and how decisions will be documented.

Step 3: Plan Your Due Diligence

Vendor selection should include due diligence steps to verify vendor claims and mitigate risks. These may include:

- Requesting references and contacting past clients
- Reviewing sample work or case studies
- Verifying financial stability or business registration
- Conducting data security or compliance assessments
- Requesting proof of insurance, certifications, or audits

List the due diligence steps your team will require before making a final selection.

Step 4: Write Your Selection Philosophy

Write a brief paragraph (five to seven sentences) explaining the philosophy behind your supplier selection approach. Your paragraph should answer:

- What is your team optimizing for in a vendor?
- What trade-offs are acceptable, and which are not?
- How does your selection process promote fairness, transparency, and alignment with C-Bay's goals?

This paragraph should reflect mature decision-making and will be referenced in later milestones when reviewing vendor proposals.

Tips and Guidance

- Avoid vague or generic criteria—be specific and measurable.
- Use weighting to make your decision process objective and defendable.
- A good process should be rigorous enough to prevent mistakes, but flexible enough to adapt to new information.
- Don't skip due diligence—it is the best way to avoid vendor regret.

Deliverable

Each team must submit:

- A completed Criteria and Weighting Table
- A documented step-by-step supplier selection process
- A list of planned due diligence actions
- A one-paragraph summary of your supplier selection philosophy

This section will directly support your vendor evaluation activities in Milestone 2.

This page titled 2.3.4.4: Supplier Selection Plan is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.3.4.5: Risk Management Plan

Planning for Outsourcing Risks

Section Overview

Outsourcing introduces new opportunities, but it also introduces risk. These risks can affect cost, quality, delivery timelines, data security, stakeholder trust, and ultimately, project success. As a project team recommending outsourcing, it is your responsibility to identify the key risks early and prepare mitigation strategies.

This section helps you develop a risk register specific to the Reckon project and build a plan for how your team and the client organization should monitor and respond to those risks during the project lifecycle.

Learning Objectives

By completing this section, you will be able to:

- Identify the common categories of risk associated with outsourcing and offshoring
- Assess the likelihood and potential impact of each risk
- Assign ownership for risk mitigation
- Develop realistic strategies to reduce or respond to risk over time

Instructions

Follow the steps below to complete your risk plan.

Step 1: Brainstorm Risk Scenarios

As a team, brainstorm at least five realistic risks that may arise from outsourcing or offshoring the components of the Reckon project. Your list may include:

- Communication breakdowns due to time zones or language
- Vendor delays that impact project timelines
- Poor deliverable quality or misaligned expectations
- Data security or intellectual property violations
- Cultural misunderstandings or differing work norms
- Inadequate vendor staffing or resource availability
- Legal or compliance issues with foreign labor laws

Use your Make-or-Buy decisions, contract type analysis, and supplier selection criteria to help surface relevant risks.

Step 2: Create the Risk Register

Use the format below to log and assess each risk.

Document and assess outsourcing risks by evaluating their likelihood, impact, mitigation approach, and ownership.

Risk Description	Likelihood (High, Medium, Low)	Impact (High, Medium, Low)	Mitigation Strategy	Owner
Example: Vendor misses delivery deadlines	Medium	High	Include penalties in contract and require biweekly check-ins	PM

Each row should describe one specific risk, an honest assessment of how likely it is to occur, how severe the consequences would be, and a practical mitigation strategy. Assign one team member or role (e.g., PM, tech lead, legal counsel) as the owner responsible for monitoring and responding to each risk.

Step 3: Write a Risk Summary

Write a short paragraph (five to seven sentences) summarizing your risk posture. Your summary should include:

- What categories of risk are most concerning and why
- How your team has structured your outsourcing recommendation to reduce risk
- How risks will be monitored during the project
- How you will escalate and respond if something goes wrong

This summary will demonstrate to stakeholders that your recommendation is realistic, responsible, and grounded in professional project planning.

Tips and Guidance

- Don't try to eliminate all risks—focus on identifying, monitoring, and mitigating the right ones.
- Assigning an owner is critical; if no one is responsible for a risk, it will go unmanaged.
- Think beyond just delivery. Include risks to brand, IP, client relationships, or compliance.
- Reference outside resources such as the ACM Job Migration Task Force report for context on global outsourcing risks.

Deliverable

Each team must submit:

- A completed Risk Register with at least five entries
- A written Risk Summary paragraph

You will refer back to this document in your Statement of Work, supplier oversight plans, and final presentation.

This page titled 2.3.4.5: Risk Management Plan is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.3.4.6: Reflection Questions and Lessons Learned

Reflecting on Outsourcing Decisions

Section Overview

Strategic decision-making improves with reflection. After completing your outsourcing analysis, it's important to step back and consider what your team learned—not only about the project, but about the process of planning, collaborating, and navigating complexity.

This section helps you analyze your decision-making approach, recognize tradeoffs, and capture insights you can apply in future milestones. In a professional setting, these types of reflections are used during post-project reviews and lessons learned sessions.

Learning Objectives

By completing this section, you will be able to:

- Identify challenges you faced during the planning process
- Reflect on how your team approached decisions under uncertainty
- Evaluate how your initial assumptions changed over time
- Translate lessons learned into actionable takeaways

Instructions

Each team member should reflect individually on the questions below. Then, as a group, synthesize your insights into a team summary. Your team may choose to assign one person to record responses, or use a shared document to collect thoughts collaboratively.

Reflection Prompts

Respond to each prompt below in 3–5 sentences. These reflections may be used in your final presentation and will help assess the depth of your strategic thinking.

1. **What surprised your team during this planning process?**
   Think about what you assumed going in versus what you discovered through analysis.

2. **Which decision was the hardest to make, and why?**
   Consider moments of uncertainty or disagreement. What tradeoffs had to be managed?

3. **What would you do differently next time?**
   If you were advising another team starting the same process, what would you recommend they focus on earlier?

4. **What strengths did your team demonstrate?**
   Identify how your team worked well—e.g., delegation, analysis, creative thinking, risk awareness.

5. **How did your team approach uncertainty or gaps in the project plan?**
   How did you validate assumptions, and how did you stay aligned?

6. **What does this experience teach you about outsourcing in real-world projects?**
   What patterns, risks, or misconceptions did this exercise help clarify?

Team Reflection Summary

Write a single paragraph summarizing what your team learned from the milestone. You can quote individual team members if you like, or synthesize common insights into a unified reflection.

This section does not need to be formal, but it should demonstrate that your team thought deeply and critically about the experience—not just the outcome.

Tips and Guidance

- Be honest. The goal of reflection is improvement, not perfection.
- Capture disagreements and how you resolved them—they are often the most valuable insights.
- Use this section as a springboard into your team presentation, if one is required.
- Don't wait until the last minute. Reflecting while the experience is fresh leads to better insight.

Deliverable

Each team must submit:

- Individual or group responses to all six reflection questions
- A final paragraph summarizing the team's overall takeaways

This section will not be scored based on "right answers," but on depth of thought, clarity, and engagement with the planning process.

This page titled 2.3.4.6: Reflection Questions and Lessons Learned is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.3.4.7: Submission Checklist and Final Assembly

Finalizing Your Milestone 1 Submission

Section Overview

A well-organized submission is a reflection of a well-managed project. This final section is your opportunity to double-check your team's work, ensure that all deliverables are complete and consistent, and prepare everything for submission and presentation.

This checklist mirrors the milestone rubric and ensures that each required task has been completed, reviewed, and compiled in the correct format.

Learning Objectives

By completing this section, you will be able to:

- Review and confirm all milestone deliverables are complete
- Organize your documents for clarity and professionalism
- Ensure consistency between analysis, decisions, and rationale
- Prepare your team for presentation, peer review, or instructor feedback

Instructions

Work as a team to complete the checklist below. Check off each item as it is finalized. At the end, assign one team member to lead the packaging of materials and final upload to your shared team folder or submission portal.

Submission Checklist

Confirm that your team has included the following items in your final Milestone 1 submission:

1. **SWOT Analysis**
   - Table with at least three items per quadrant
   - Summary paragraph explaining strategic context
2. **Make-or-Buy Analysis**
   - Table of key project components with sourcing decisions
   - Summary paragraph explaining rationale and internal resource needs
3. **Contract Type Evaluation**
   - Comparison table of major contract types
   - Paragraph explaining contract recommendation and justification
4. **Supplier Selection Plan**
   - Weighted criteria table with descriptions
   - Description of selection process and due diligence steps
   - One-paragraph selection philosophy
5. **Risk Management Plan**
   - Risk register with at least five clearly defined risks
   - Risk summary paragraph describing overall risk posture
6. **Reflection Questions**
   - Responses to all six team reflection questions
   - Final team lessons learned summary paragraph
7. **Organization and Professionalism**
   - All documents named and formatted clearly
   - All tables, summaries, and templates integrated into a single cohesive document

- All team members credited
- Optional: Slides or summary prepared for class presentation

Final Packaging Instructions

- Place all deliverables into a single PDF or well-organized shared folder.
- Use consistent document naming conventions (e.g., “Team3_Milestone1_Summary.pdf”).
- Include a short cover page with:
  - Team name
  - Team members’ names
  - Milestone title and date

Optional Presentation Preparation

If your team is presenting in class:

- Prepare a short slide deck (5–7 slides) highlighting your key decisions and rationale
- Assign presenters for each major section
- Use visuals where helpful, but prioritize clarity and confidence

Deliverable

Each team must submit:

- A complete milestone workbook with all required sections
- All content reviewed for accuracy, clarity, and consistency

All files uploaded to the designated team folder or submission portal by the due date

This page titled 2.3.4.7: Submission Checklist and Final Assembly is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

2.3.4.8: Reflection and Final Submission

Reflecting on the Planning Process and Finalizing Your Submission

You've worked through every phase of the outsourcing planning process: analyzing C-Bay's strategic posture, deciding what to outsource, evaluating contract types, planning vendor selection, and assessing risks. Now it's time to pause, reflect, and ensure your team's deliverables are complete, coherent, and presentation-ready.

This section is about two things:

1. **Reflection** – Capturing what your team learned, what surprised you, and how your thinking evolved
2. **Submission Review** – Packaging your materials professionally for evaluation or presentation

Step 1: Individual and Team Reflection

Each member of your team should answer the following reflection prompts individually or in small groups. Then, your team should work together to synthesize these insights into a final paragraph representing your collective experience.

Reflection Prompts

Answer each prompt in 3–5 sentences.

1. **What did your team assume at the beginning of this milestone—and how did your thinking change as you progressed?**
   Think about beliefs around outsourcing, vendors, internal resources, or risk.

2. **What part of the milestone required the most critical thinking or debate?**
   Was it the make-or-buy decision? Selecting contract types? Discussing vendor trust? What made it difficult?

3. **What would your team do differently if you were starting over?**
   Consider both your project planning process and how you worked as a team.

4. **What professional skill did you practice or improve during this milestone?**
   Examples might include stakeholder analysis, structured reasoning, facilitation, or clear writing.

5. **What advice would you give to another team starting this milestone?**
   Help future students avoid your biggest pain point or make better use of their time.

Team Reflection Summary

Once all team members have shared, write a single paragraph (6–8 sentences) that summarizes your team's lessons learned. Capture your collective insight, growth, and recommendations for the future.

You may include direct quotes or organize your reflection around key themes (e.g., clarity, collaboration, strategy, surprises).

This summary will be read by reviewers and may be included in your final presentation materials.

Step 2: Submission Checklist

Use this checklist to confirm that each milestone component is complete and professionally packaged. Each item should be clearly labeled, grammatically polished, and logically organized.

Use this checklist to verify that all milestone deliverables are complete, organized, and ready for su

Component	Completed (✔)
SWOT Analysis	
Make-or-Buy Table and Summary	
Contract Evaluation and Rationale	
Supplier Selection Plan	
Risk Register and Mitigation Plan	
Team Reflection Summary	
Folder/Document Naming Consistency	
Optional Presentation Slides	

Final File Assembly

Your submission should include:

- A clearly labeled team folder or PDF with all milestone sections
- Consistent formatting and professional tone throughout
- A short cover page with team name, team members, milestone title, and date
- Optional slide deck if you will be presenting your findings

If using a shared Google Drive, OneDrive, or Canvas upload area, ensure that:

- All permissions are set correctly
- Your instructor has edit or view access
- Nothing is left in draft or unlinked documents

Final Prompt

Before you submit, ask yourselves:

- Does this milestone reflect professional-level thinking?
- Would a real client trust this plan and feel confident moving forward?
- Did we balance rigor with clarity? Did we challenge ourselves to go deeper?
- Are we proud of what we've built—together?

This page titled 2.3.4.8: Reflection and Final Submission is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

3: BUILDING THE PROCUREMENT AND SOLICITATION PLAN

3.1: Outsourcing Brief

3.2: Plan of Attack (with Templates)

3.3: Learning Resources

3.4: Tips and Traps

3.5: FAQs

3.6: Grading Rubric – Chapter 3- Procurement and Solicitation Plan

3.7: Reflection and Analysis Questions

3.8: Submission Checklist

This page titled 3: Building the Procurement and Solicitation Plan is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

3.1: Outsourcing Brief

From Outsourcing Strategy to Procurement Execution

In **Milestone 1**, your team completed a comprehensive outsourcing analysis. You evaluated strategic readiness, identified what should be outsourced, assessed contract models, designed a supplier selection philosophy, and documented key risks. You then assembled those components into a professional, coherent submission using the **Submission Checklist and Final Assembly**.

That work is now complete.

In **Milestone 2**, the focus shifts from *decision-making* to *execution planning*. The question is no longer **whether** outsourcing makes sense or **what** should be outsourced. Instead, the organization is now asking:

> *How do we execute this outsourcing decision in a disciplined, fair, and defensible way?*

This milestone begins that transition.

The Situation

Senior leadership has reviewed your Milestone 1 submission and agrees with the overall outsourcing direction. However, leadership has also made it clear that strategic intent alone is not sufficient. Before any vendors can be contacted, proposals solicited, or contracts signed, the organization requires a **formal Procurement and Solicitation Plan**.

This plan must do more than list steps. It must:

- Translate outsourcing strategy into **repeatable procurement processes**
- Link procurement decisions directly to **service delivery outcomes**
- Demonstrate that the organization understands **risk, governance, and accountability**
- Stand alone as a complete document for procurement, legal, and management audiences

In short, leadership wants proof that the outsourcing decision can be executed responsibly.

Your Role

You are now operating as part of the **procurement and project leadership team**, responsible for designing the full Procurement and Solicitation Plan that will govern vendor engagement from start to finish.

You are not starting from scratch.

Your inputs for this milestone include:

- The finalized **Milestone 1 Planning Workbook**
- Your approved outsourcing strategy and make-or-buy decisions
- Your selected contract model and supplier selection philosophy
- Your documented risks and mitigation approach
- Prior discussions and direction provided by leadership

Some content in this plan will intentionally overlap with Milestone 1. This duplication is **by design**. Each document must be complete and understandable on its own, without requiring the reader to reference prior coursework.

What This Document Must Accomplish

The Procurement and Solicitation Plan you create in this chapter must clearly answer the following:

- Why the organization is outsourcing this work
- What scope and milestones are being outsourced
- How vendors will be identified, evaluated, and selected
- How procurement decisions align with delivery, quality, budget, and schedule
- Who is responsible at each stage of the process
- How risks will be managed once vendors are engaged
- How the contract will be executed, monitored, and closed

This is not a theoretical exercise. This is the type of document used in real organizations to:

- Justify procurement actions
- Defend sourcing decisions during audits
- Guide cross-functional teams (procurement, legal, IT, PMO)
- Ensure fairness, transparency, and accountability

What Comes Next

In the sections that follow, you will:

- Write a formal **Introduction** that defines the purpose, scope, audience, and inputs for the Procurement and Solicitation Plan
- Articulate a clear **Procurement Strategy** that reinforces the outsourcing rationale and defines success
- Reconfirm **Project Scope Identification for Outsourcing**, aligned with milestones and delivery phases
- Fully document the **Procurement and Solicitation Process**, step by step, including:
  - Establishing requirements
  - Using SOWs and RFPs
  - Evaluating vendor responses
  - Negotiating and signing contracts
  - Managing vendor performance across quality, scope, budget, and schedule
  - Closing the project using formal PMBOK-aligned practices
- Identify **roles, responsibilities, timelines, risks, and outputs** for each step
- Prepare the plan for **management sign-off**
- Use provided **templates** (SOW, RFP, contract, scorecards) to support your work

Mindset for This Milestone

Milestone 1 asked you to *think strategically*.

Milestone 2 asks you to *think operationally and defensibly*.

Assume that:

- Your document may be reviewed by procurement officers
- Legal teams may rely on it to structure contracts
- Auditors may examine it for fairness and rigor
- Vendors may indirectly experience its consequences

Clarity, structure, and professionalism matter.

This chapter represents the moment where outsourcing becomes **real**.

This page titled 3.1: Outsourcing Brief is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

3.2: Plan of Attack (with Templates)

Designing and Documenting the Procurement and Solicitation Plan

Milestone 2 represents a clear shift in mindset and responsibility.

In **Milestone 1**, you acted as strategic advisors—analyzing whether outsourcing made sense, what should be outsourced, and what risks and tradeoffs were involved.

In **Milestone 2**, you now act as **procurement and project leaders**, responsible for designing the **mechanisms** that will turn that strategy into an executable, governed, and defensible reality.

Your task is to produce a **Procurement and Solicitation Plan** (pdf)—a formal document that explains *how* the organization will engage vendors, evaluate proposals, negotiate contracts, manage delivery, and close the work.

This is not a conceptual paper.
This is an **operational playbook**.

What You Are Building

By the end of this milestone, you will have created a document that could realistically be used to:

- Authorize procurement activity
- Guide procurement officers through vendor engagement
- Enable legal teams to structure enforceable contracts
- Allow project managers to manage outsourced delivery
- Provide leadership with confidence that outsourcing is being executed responsibly

This document must stand on its own. Someone reading it should not need to reference your Milestone 1 submission to understand:

- Why outsourcing is happening
- What is being outsourced
- How vendors will be selected
- How risks will be controlled
- How success will be measured

How to Execute This Milestone

You will build the Procurement and Solicitation Plan in **five core sections**, supported by templates, tools, and PMBOK-aligned processes. Each section has a specific purpose and audience.

Step 1: Write the Introduction

The Introduction sets context and establishes authority.

In this section, you must clearly document four elements:

Purpose

Explain *why* this Procurement and Solicitation Plan exists.
Typical purposes include:

- Translating outsourcing strategy into executable procurement actions
- Defining a standardized, repeatable sourcing process
- Ensuring fairness, transparency, and accountability in vendor selection
- Linking procurement decisions to delivery outcomes

This should be written in clear, professional language suitable for leadership review.

Scope

Define what the document **covers** and what it **does not cover**.

For example:

- Covers: vendor selection, contracting, execution oversight, and closeout
- Does not cover: internal system design, detailed technical architecture, or post-project operations beyond closure

Scope boundaries prevent misinterpretation and scope creep at the document level.

Intended Audience

Identify who this document is written for, such as:

- Procurement and sourcing teams
- Project and program managers
- Legal and contract management teams
- Senior leadership approving procurement actions

This signals that the document is formal and cross-functional.

Inputs Considered

Explicitly state that this plan is based on:

- The approved outsourcing strategy from Milestone 1
- The make-or-buy analysis and risk posture
- Prior discussions with organizational leadership

This establishes continuity and traceability.

Step 2: Define the Procurement Strategy

Before completing this section, review the How to Write *a* **Procurement Strategy** *(PDF)* guide. This resource explains the purpose of a procurement strategy and provides guidance on developing a clear, well-supported approach for your plan. Refer to it as you complete this section.

This section is the **strategic anchor** of the entire plan.

Here, you will restate—briefly but clearly—**why outsourcing is being pursued**, but through a procurement lens rather than a strategic analysis lens.

You should address:

- The business objectives driving outsourcing
- The specific outcomes expected from external vendors
- How procurement supports delivery quality, speed, and risk management
- How success will be measured (not just cost, but performance and reliability)

This section should connect:

- Outsourcing rationale
- Service delivery expectations
- Governance and accountability

Think of this as the justification a procurement officer would use when asked,
“Why are we sourcing this externally?”

Step 3: Identify Project Scope for Outsourcing

This section translates strategy into **actionable scope**. (from the project plan)

You must clearly document:

- Which components, phases, or milestones are being outsourced
- Why those components were selected
- Where vendor responsibility begins and ends
- What remains internal and how handoffs occur

You should also describe the **process approach**:

- Phased outsourcing vs. single engagement
- Competitive sourcing vs. negotiated sourcing
- Pilot or transition phase before full engagement

This section removes ambiguity and sets the stage for the SOW and RFP.

Step 4: Document the Procurement and Solicitation Process

This is the **largest and most detailed section** of the plan.

You must enumerate each step of the procurement and solicitation process and, for each step, document:

- **Purpose of the step**
- **Where it fits in the SDLC**
- **Expected outputs or artifacts**
- **Roles and parties involved**
- **Risks if the step is performed inadequately**

At a minimum, include the following subprocesses:

Establish Requirements

Explain how requirement artifacts are used by vendors:

- How vendors are expected to review and validate requirements
- How questions or gaps are addressed
- Risks of unclear or incomplete requirements

You are not recreating the documents—you are defining their **use**.

Statement of Work (SOW)

Explain:

- How the SOW is derived from scope and requirements

- How it is used during solicitation and contracting
- How it governs delivery, milestones, and quality

Then, using the provided template, **document the SOW itself**.

Create and Send RFP

Document:

- How vendors are identified and prequalified
- How the RFP is structured
- How communication with vendors is controlled
- How fairness and transparency are maintained

Use the RFP template as guidance, but adapt it to your plan.

RFP Response and Vendor Selection

Define:

- Vendor evaluation criteria
- Weighting or rating system
- Selection participants and roles
- Whether selection is collaborative and how consensus is reached

Include or reference a **vendor evaluation template**.

Negotiate and Sign Contract

Document:

- Contract type and structure
- Negotiation steps
- Parties involved (procurement, legal, PM, vendor)
- Approval and signing process

This should reflect the contract model chosen in Milestone 1. Document the contract (Template) for negotiation.

Manage the Outsourced Work

This section must rely heavily on **PMBOK Execution processes**.

For each pillar—**Quality, Budget, Schedule, Scope and Team**—document:

- Monitoring processes
- Responsible roles
- Reporting frequency
- Templates or reports used

This shows that outsourcing is actively managed, not passively monitored.

Using the template document how you would manage the outsourced work.

Manage, Evaluate, and Monitor the Contract

Explain how:

- Risks are tracked and escalated
- Performance issues are addressed
- Corrective actions are taken
- Governance is enforced

Document using this template

Close the Project

Using PMBOK Closing processes, document:

- Acceptance criteria
- Final deliverables review
- Budget reconciliation
- Lessons learned
- Formal closure steps

Include a checklist aligned with the five pillars.

Step 5: Refine Roles, Timeline, and Outputs

Before finalizing the plan:

- Identify **core drivers and participants** at each step
- Estimate **duration** (weeks or days) for each phase
- List all **expected outputs** produced by the process

This step ensures the plan is realistic and executable.

Step 6: Procurement Plan Sign-Off

End the document with a formal sign-off section that includes:

- Statement requiring management approval
- Named approving roles
- Signature and date fields

This reinforces governance and accountability.

How to Think While Writing

Write this plan as if:

- It will be audited
- It will be used by someone who wasn't in your class
- A vendor might eventually infer its contents
- Leadership will rely on it to authorize spending

Precision, clarity, and structure matter.

Final Guidance

Milestone 2 is where outsourcing becomes operational reality.

If Milestone 1 answered *"Should we outsource?"*,
Milestone 2 answers *"Can we execute this well?"*

A strong Procurement and Solicitation Plan prevents:

- Vendor confusion
- Internal misalignment
- Legal exposure
- Delivery failure

And that makes it one of the most important documents in the entire outsourcing lifecycle.

This page titled 3.2: Plan of Attack (with Templates) is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

3.3: Learning Resources

Supporting the Procurement and Solicitation Plan

This chapter requires you to move from strategic reasoning into formal procurement execution.

Outsourcing Plan from Milestone 1

Your completed Outsourcing Plan serves as the primary input for this chapter. It contains the strategic reasoning, scope decisions, risk posture, and contract direction that procurement must now operationalize.

As you write the Procurement and Solicitation Plan, you should consistently refer back to this earlier work to ensure continuity. Procurement strategy, scope identification, vendor selection criteria, and contract structure must align with the decisions already made. Any disconnect between the outsourcing rationale and procurement execution weakens the credibility of the plan.

This resource ensures that procurement activity is driven by strategy—not convenience or assumption.

Procurement and Solicitation Lifecycle Guidance

This resource outlines the end-to-end flow of procurement and solicitation activities, from requirements definition through vendor selection, contract execution, and closure.

You should use this guidance to:

- Structure the sequence of procurement steps
- Ensure no critical phase is skipped
- Clearly explain how each step produces specific outputs
- Demonstrate that procurement activities follow an industry-recognized lifecycle

This ensures your plan reflects a disciplined process rather than an ad hoc collection of tasks.

Project Management Execution and Closing Practices

Industry-standard project management practices, particularly those aligned with PMBOK Execution and Closing process groups, inform how outsourced work is governed once a contract is in place.

These practices guide:

- How quality, schedule, budget, scope, and team performance are monitored
- How risks and issues are escalated and resolved
- How vendor work is evaluated during execution
- How projects and contracts are formally closed

Rather than quoting formal standards, you should apply these principles conceptually when describing how outsourced work will be managed and brought to completion.

This reinforces the idea that outsourcing does not remove project management responsibility—it increases it.

Scope Definition and Work Description Artifacts

Clear scope definition is critical to successful procurement. Resources that describe outsourced work, deliverables, milestones, and acceptance criteria provide the foundation for vendor understanding and accountability.

These artifacts should be referenced when:

- Explaining how vendors interpret requirements
- Describing how scope boundaries are enforced
- Documenting how work is accepted or rejected
- Managing changes to scope during execution

They ensure that outsourced work is defined in operational terms, not informal expectations.

Vendor Solicitation and Proposal Guidance

Structured guidance for requesting and reviewing vendor proposals ensures fairness, consistency, and defensibility in supplier selection.

You should rely on this guidance when:

- Describing how vendors are identified and contacted
- Explaining how proposals are submitted and reviewed
- Establishing communication protocols during solicitation
- Preventing bias or informal influence during evaluation

This resource supports transparent procurement practices and protects the organization from selection challenges or audit exposure.

Vendor Evaluation and Scoring Practices

Objective evaluation methods support informed vendor selection and reduce reliance on subjective judgment.

These practices guide:

- How evaluation criteria are defined and weighted
- How proposals are reviewed independently and collectively
- How consensus is reached across procurement and project stakeholders
- How selection decisions are documented and justified

They ensure that vendor selection reflects best value rather than lowest cost or personal preference.

Contract Governance and Legal Frameworks

Contract governance resources define how the relationship between the organization and the vendor is structured, enforced, and monitored.

These resources inform:

- Contract structure and alignment with contract type
- Roles and responsibilities for enforcement
- Payment and invoicing controls
- Change management and dispute resolution
- Termination and exit planning

They ensure that procurement decisions translate into enforceable obligations rather than informal agreements.

Risk, Issue, and Change Management Practices

Effective outsourcing requires proactive management of uncertainty and disruption. Resources addressing risks, issues, and change control guide how problems are identified, documented, escalated, and resolved.

You should rely on these practices when:

- Differentiating between future risks and current issues
- Explaining escalation paths and corrective actions
- Managing changes to scope, cost, or schedule
- Maintaining control throughout execution

These resources demonstrate that outsourcing is governed with foresight rather than reaction.

Performance Evaluation and Close-Out Guidance

Resources supporting performance evaluation and close-out ensure that outsourcing engagements conclude with clarity and accountability.

They guide:

- Ongoing assessment of vendor performance
- Formal acceptance of deliverables
- Financial reconciliation and final payment
- Knowledge transfer and documentation handoff
- Lessons learned and contract closure

They reinforce that procurement responsibility does not end at contract signature—it ends at formal closure.

Using These Resources Effectively

These resources are designed to work together as an integrated system. Each one reinforces the others and supports a complete procurement narrative that moves logically from strategy to execution to closure.

When used properly, they:

- Strengthen the professionalism of your Procurement and Solicitation Plan
- Improve clarity for procurement, legal, and project audiences
- Reduce ambiguity in vendor engagement
- Demonstrate real-world readiness and governance discipline

Final Guidance

Approach these resources as you would in a professional role. Use them to justify decisions, structure processes, and enforce accountability—not as academic checklists.

If your Procurement and Solicitation Plan reads as something a real organization could approve and execute, you are using these resources correctly.

This page titled 3.3: Learning Resources is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

3.4: Tips and Traps

What to Do—and What to Avoid—When Designing the Procurement and Solicitation Plan

Designing a Procurement and Solicitation Plan is where outsourcing decisions either become executable—or fall apart under pressure. At this stage, teams are no longer debating whether outsourcing is a good idea. They are defining the processes that will govern real vendor behavior, real money, and real delivery risk.

The tips and traps below are drawn from common failure points in real-world procurement efforts. Use them to strengthen your plan, avoid predictable mistakes, and demonstrate professional-level judgment.

Tip: Write for Execution, Not Explanation

Your Procurement and Solicitation Plan should read like something that could be handed to a procurement officer or project manager and executed without additional interpretation.

Strong plans:

- Clearly define who does what, when, and how
- Describe processes in operational terms
- Use precise language rather than general intentions

If a reader has to ask, *"So how would this actually work?"*, the plan needs refinement.

Trap: Execution Gap

Writing a plan that explains *why* procurement matters but never explains *how* procurement will be carried out.

Tip: Maintain Alignment with the Outsourcing Plan

Milestone 2 builds directly on Milestone 1. The procurement strategy, scope identification, contract approach, and vendor selection logic must align with the decisions already made.

Strong plans:

- Reinforce the outsourcing rationale without re-litigating it
- Use consistent language for scope and responsibilities
- Reflect the same risk posture and contract direction

Trap: Breaking Alignment

Quietly changing scope, contract type, or risk assumptions during procurement planning without acknowledging the shift.

Tip: Be Explicit About Boundaries

Procurement plans fail most often at the boundaries—where vendor responsibility ends and internal responsibility begins.

Strong plans:

- Clearly state what is in scope and out of scope
- Define handoffs between internal teams and vendors

- Identify approval points and decision authority

Ambiguity here leads to disputes later.

Trap: Boundary Ambiguity

Assuming vendors will “just know” what is expected, or leaving scope boundaries implied rather than documented.

Tip: Treat Requirements as Governance Tools

Requirements documents are not just technical artifacts—they are procurement controls.

Strong plans:

- Explain how vendors are expected to review, validate, and respond to requirements
- Describe how requirement clarity is enforced before solicitation
- Identify risks if requirements are incomplete or misunderstood

This shows that procurement is managing risk proactively.

Trap: Uncontrolled Requirements

Listing requirements documents without explaining how they are used to control vendor understanding and accountability.

Tip: Design Vendor Selection for Fairness and Defensibility

Vendor selection is one of the most scrutinized parts of procurement. Your plan must show that selection decisions are objective, fair, and repeatable.

Strong plans:

- Use defined evaluation criteria and weighting
- Describe who participates in evaluation and how consensus is reached
- Control vendor communication during solicitation

This protects the organization and the project team.

Trap: Subjective Vendor Selection

Letting selection decisions appear subjective, informal, or driven by personal preference.

Tip: Link Procurement Decisions to Delivery Outcomes

Procurement is not successful when a contract is signed—it is successful when services are delivered as expected.

Strong plans:

- Explain how procurement choices support quality, schedule, budget, and scope control
- Show how contracts and governance enable delivery discipline
- Tie evaluation criteria to operational outcomes

This positions procurement as a delivery enabler.

Trap: Procurement-Delivery Disconnect

Treating procurement as a standalone administrative function disconnected from execution.

Tip: Plan for Active Vendor Management

Outsourcing increases—not decreases—the need for project management.

Strong plans:

- Define monitoring processes across quality, budget, schedule, scope, and team
- Assign clear ownership for oversight
- Specify reporting frequency and escalation paths

This demonstrates maturity and realism.

Trap: Oversight Abdication

Assuming vendor accountability replaces internal accountability.

Tip: Use Change Control as a Safety Valve, Not a Bureaucracy

Change is inevitable. Your plan should show how changes are managed, not suppressed.

Strong plans:

- Define how scope, cost, and schedule changes are reviewed and approved
- Require impact analysis before approval
- Document decisions formally

This protects both the organization and the vendor.

Trap: Change Control Imbalance

Either ignoring change control entirely or designing it so rigidly that it discourages necessary adaptation.

Tip: Separate Risks from Issues

Professional procurement distinguishes between:

- **Risks**: Potential future events
- **Issues**: Current problems requiring action

Strong plans:

- Track risks proactively
- Escalate issues immediately
- Use different processes and logs for each

This improves clarity and response speed.

Trap: Risk-Issue Confusion

Treating everything as a “risk” and delaying action on real problems.

Tip: Close the Contract as Carefully as You Open It

Procurement responsibility does not end when work stops.

Strong plans:

- Define formal close-out steps
- Ensure deliverables are accepted and documented
- Resolve financials, access, and obligations
- Capture lessons learned and vendor performance insights

This protects the organization and informs future sourcing decisions.

Trap: Incomplete Contrast Closure

Letting contracts quietly expire without formal closure, leaving unresolved obligations or lingering access.

Final Advice

Chapter 3 is where outsourcing becomes real.

A strong Procurement and Solicitation Plan shows that your team understands not just **what** outsourcing is, but **how** it is executed responsibly. Precision, clarity, and discipline matter more here than creativity or ambition.

If your plan:

- Could survive audit or legal review
- Could be executed by someone outside your team
- Clearly connects strategy to delivery

Then you are doing this work at a professional level.

This page titled 3.4: Tips and Traps is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

3.5: FAQs

Clarifying Procurement and Solicitation Planning

How is this milestone different from Milestone 1?

Milestone 1 focused on **decision-making**: whether outsourcing made sense, what should be outsourced, which contract type to use, and what risks exist.

Milestone 2 focuses on **execution design**: how the organization will carry out those decisions in a structured, defensible, and repeatable way. You are no longer debating strategy—you are designing the machinery that turns strategy into action.

Why does the Procurement and Solicitation Plan repeat information from the Outsourcing Plan?

This duplication is intentional. Each document serves a different audience and purpose.

The Outsourcing Plan explains *why* outsourcing is being pursued.
The Procurement and Solicitation Plan explains *how* that decision will be executed.

In real organizations, procurement documents must stand on their own. They cannot assume the reader has access to prior planning artifacts.

Are we expected to contact real vendors or issue a real RFP?

No. This is a simulated procurement exercise.

However, you should write your plan **as if** it will be used in a real procurement. Use professional language, realistic timelines, and credible processes. The quality of your thinking and documentation matters more than actual vendor engagement.

How detailed does the Procurement and Solicitation Process need to be?

Detailed enough that someone outside your team could execute it.

For each procurement step, you should clearly document:

- Purpose of the step
- Expected outputs
- Roles involved
- Risks if the step is done poorly

Avoid high-level summaries that skip operational detail.

Do we need to recreate requirements documents (URD, HLDD, SRS)?

No. You are not required to author full requirements documents.

Your responsibility is to explain **how those documents would be used by vendors**—how vendors review them, ask questions, validate understanding, and base their proposals on them.

How realistic do our timelines need to be?

Your timelines should be **plausible and defensible**, not arbitrary.

They should reflect:

- Time needed for vendor questions and responses
- Internal review and approval cycles
- Negotiation and contract execution
- Transition and onboarding considerations

You are not graded on exact durations—but unrealistic timelines weaken your plan.

Can we assume the vendor will “just manage themselves”?

No. That assumption is one of the most common outsourcing failures.

Outsourcing does not remove accountability. It increases the need for:

- Defined monitoring processes
- Clear reporting expectations
- Active project management
- Formal governance and escalation

Your plan must show that vendor work is actively managed.

What if our procurement strategy conflicts with organizational policy or constraints?

In real organizations, procurement strategies must operate within policy constraints.

For this milestone, you should:

- Clearly state any assumed constraints
- Design procurement processes that respect governance expectations
- Explain tradeoffs where necessary

Demonstrating awareness of constraints strengthens your plan.

Do we need to choose between competitive procurement and negotiation?

Yes—but your choice must be justified.

You should clearly explain:

- Why a competitive or negotiated approach is appropriate
- How fairness and transparency are ensured
- How risks are mitigated regardless of approach

There is no “correct” choice—only a defensible one.

How do we handle scope changes during execution?

Your plan must include a **formal change control process**.

This process should:

- Require documentation of change requests
- Include impact analysis on scope, cost, and schedule
- Define approval authority
- Prevent unauthorized work

Ignoring change control is not acceptable in professional procurement.

How much detail is expected in contract monitoring and governance?

Enough to demonstrate discipline and accountability.

Your plan should clearly explain:

- How performance issues are identified
- How risks are escalated
- How corrective actions are agreed and tracked
- Who has authority to enforce contract terms

Governance must be explicit—not implied.

What does “success” look like for this milestone?

Success means producing a Procurement and Solicitation Plan that:

- Aligns with the outsourcing strategy
- Can be executed by a procurement or project team
- Demonstrates professional judgment and realism
- Shows clear connections between procurement decisions and delivery outcomes

If your plan feels like something a real organization could approve and use, you are on the right track.

Final Reminder

Milestone 2 is not about perfection—it’s about **professional execution readiness**.

If your plan:

- Anticipates risks
- Defines accountability
- Enforces governance
- And supports delivery

Then you are thinking like a procurement and project leader—not just a student.

This page titled 3.5: FAQs is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

3.6: Grading Rubric – Chapter 3- Procurement and Solicitation Plan

Milestone 2: From Outsourcing Strategy to Vendor Selection

Total Points: 100

This rubric evaluates your ability to translate an approved outsourcing strategy into a **complete, executable, and professionally governed Procurement and Solicitation Plan**.

Introduction (Purpose, Scope, Audience, Inputs)

10 points

Rubric criteria for evaluating the introduction section, including purpose, scope, audience, and required inputs for the procurement plan.

Performance Level	Criteria
Excellent (9–10)	Clearly articulates purpose, scope boundaries, intended audience, and inputs. Reads like a real procurement document.
Satisfactory (7–8)	Covers all required elements but lacks precision or professional tone in places.
Needs Improvement (5–6)	Missing one element or unclear boundaries.
Unsatisfactory (0–4)	Introduction is vague, incomplete, or missing key elements.

Procurement Strategy

15 points

Rubric criteria for evaluating the procurement strategy, including outsourcing rationale, procurement objectives, delivery outcomes, risk management, and measures of success.

Performance Level	Criteria
Excellent (14–15)	Clearly explains why outsourcing is being pursued, defines procurement objectives, links procurement decisions to service delivery outcomes, and defines success beyond cost.
Satisfactory (11–13)	Strategy is sound but weakly connected to delivery or risk management.
Needs Improvement (8–10)	Strategy repeats outsourcing plan without procurement focus or lacks success measures.
Unsatisfactory (0–7)	Procurement strategy is unclear, generic, or missing.

Project Scope Identification for Outsourcing

10 points

Rubric criteria for evaluating how clearly the outsourced scope, internal responsibilities, milestones, and project boundaries are defined.

Performance Level	Criteria
Excellent (9–10)	Clearly defines outsourced scope, in-house responsibilities, milestones, and boundaries. Eliminates ambiguity.
Satisfactory (7–8)	Scope defined but boundaries or rationale are partially unclear.
Needs Improvement (5–6)	Scope is vague or lacks justification.
Unsatisfactory (0–4)	Scope is poorly defined or missing.

Procurement and Solicitation Process (End-to-End)

25 points

Rubric criteria for evaluating the completeness, structure, and practicality of the end-to-end procurement and solicitation process, from requirements definition through vendor closeout.

Performance Level	Criteria
Excellent (23–25)	Fully documents all procurement steps (requirements, SOW, RFP, evaluation, negotiation, execution, monitoring, close-out). Links steps to SDLC, outputs, roles, and risks.
Satisfactory (19–22)	All steps included but some lack depth or risk awareness.
Needs Improvement (14–18)	Missing detail in multiple steps or weak linkage to execution.
Unsatisfactory (0–13)	Process is incomplete, disorganized, or unrealistic.

Vendor Selection and Evaluation Approach

10 points

Rubric criteria for evaluating the vendor selection process, including evaluation criteria, weighting methodology, collaboration approach, and justification for supplier selection decisions.

Performance Level	Criteria
Excellent (9–10)	Uses clear evaluation criteria, weighting, collaboration model, and defensible selection logic.
Satisfactory (7–8)	Evaluation approach present but lacks rigor or clarity.
Needs Improvement (5–6)	Criteria vague or scoring logic weak.
Unsatisfactory (0–4)	Vendor selection approach unclear or missing.

Contract Management, Monitoring, and Governance

15 points

Rubric criteria for evaluating how vendor performance, risks, issues, and contract obligations are monitored, managed, and governed throughout the engagement.

Performance Level	Criteria
Excellent (14–15)	Clearly defines how risks are tracked, issues escalated, performance managed, corrective actions enforced, and governance applied. PMBOK-aligned.
Satisfactory (11–13)	Governance described but lacks enforcement detail or clarity.
Needs Improvement (8–10)	Monitoring is superficial or passive.
Unsatisfactory (0–7)	Contract governance largely missing or unrealistic.

Project and Contract Close-Out

5 points

Rubric criteria for evaluating the completeness and quality of project and contract close-out activities, including acceptance, documentation, lessons learned, and formal closure procedures.

Performance Level	Criteria
Excellent (5)	Close-out process is complete, structured, and aligned to PMBOK Closing processes.
Satisfactory (4)	Close-out included but lacks depth.
Needs Improvement (3)	Close-out vague or incomplete.
Unsatisfactory (0–2)	Close-out missing or incorrect.

Professionalism, Organization, and Clarity

10 points

Rubric criteria for evaluating the overall quality of the procurement plan, including organization, clarity, professional presentation, and consistency across all sections.

Performance Level	Criteria
Excellent (9–10)	Document is well-organized, clearly written, professionally formatted, and cohesive.
Satisfactory (7–8)	Generally clear with minor organization or clarity issues.
Needs Improvement (5–6)	Difficult to follow or inconsistently formatted.
Unsatisfactory (0–4)	Disorganized, unclear, or unprofessional.

Final Notes for Students

This milestone is evaluated as a **professional procurement document**, not an academic essay. Clarity, realism, and execution-readiness matter.

If your plan could:

- Be approved by leadership
- Be executed by procurement staff
- Survive audit or legal review

...then you are meeting the intent of this milestone.

This page titled 3.6: Grading Rubric – Chapter 3- Procurement and Solicitation Plan is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

3.7: Reflection and Analysis Questions

Thinking Like a Procurement and Project Leader

These questions are intended to help you step back from the mechanics of procurement and reflect on the **decisions, tradeoffs, and responsibilities** involved in executing an outsourcing strategy. Responses should demonstrate insight, honesty, and professional reasoning rather than simply restating what was done.

From Strategy to Execution

How did your thinking change as you moved from the outsourcing strategy in Milestone 1 to the procurement execution plan in Milestone 2? What assumptions were challenged or refined?

Procurement as a Delivery Enabler

Which procurement decisions in your plan most directly influenced service delivery outcomes such as quality, schedule reliability, or risk reduction? Why?

Managing Uncertainty

Which parts of the procurement and solicitation process felt most uncertain or difficult to define? How did your team account for that uncertainty in your plan?

Risk Ownership and Accountability

Which risks concerned you the most once the outsourcing decision became executable? How did your procurement strategy and governance processes address those risks?

Fairness vs. Flexibility

How did your team balance fairness and transparency in vendor selection with the need for flexibility and speed? What tradeoffs did you consciously make?

Contract as a Governance Tool

In what ways did your view of contracts change through this milestone? How did the contract evolve from a legal document into an execution and governance mechanism?

Team and Organizational Impact

How did considerations around internal teams, vendor relationships, and organizational dynamics influence your procurement decisions?

Execution Readiness

If your Procurement and Solicitation Plan were approved tomorrow, what parts of execution would you feel most confident about? What parts would you monitor most closely?

Professional Growth

What new skills or ways of thinking did you develop during this milestone that you did not practice in Milestone 1?

Looking Ahead

If you were to revisit this plan six months into execution, what do you expect would change—and why?

Submission Guidance

Responses should:

- Be concise but reflective
- Reference specific decisions from your plan where appropriate
- Demonstrate professional judgment rather than perfection

These reflections are not graded on having “correct” answers. They are evaluated on depth of thought, clarity, and connection to real-world execution.

This page titled 3.7: Reflection and Analysis Questions is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

3.8: Submission Checklist

Checklist and Reflection

This checklist is your final quality gate before submission. A complete, well-organized procurement package signals execution readiness and professional discipline. Use this checklist to confirm that your Procurement and Solicitation Plan is coherent, defensible, and ready for review.

A. Procurement and Solicitation Plan – Core Sections

Confirm that your document includes all of the following sections and that each section is fully developed:

- **Introduction**
  - Clearly states the purpose of the document
  - Defines scope boundaries (what is included and excluded)
  - Identifies the intended audience
  - References the inputs used (outsourcing plan, leadership direction)
- **Procurement Strategy**
  - Restates why outsourcing is being pursued (procurement lens)
  - Defines procurement objectives
  - Links procurement decisions to service delivery outcomes
  - Defines how procurement success will be measured
- **Project Scope Identification for Outsourcing**
  - Clearly identifies what is being outsourced
  - Identifies what remains in-house
  - Defines scope boundaries and handoffs
  - Explains why selected components are suitable for outsourcing

---

B. Procurement and Solicitation Process

Confirm that the end-to-end process is fully documented and executable:

- **Establish Requirements**
  - Explains how requirements are provided to vendors
  - Describes vendor validation and clarification process
  - Identifies risks of unclear or incomplete requirements
- **Statement of Work**
  - Defines scope, deliverables, milestones, and acceptance criteria
  - Aligns with outsourcing scope and procurement strategy
- **Request for Proposal**
  - Describes how vendors are identified and invited
  - Defines communication controls and timelines
  - Aligns proposal expectations with scope and SOW
- **Vendor Evaluation and Selection**
  - Clearly defined evaluation criteria and weighting
  - Describes collaborative evaluation process
  - Explains how selection decisions are justified and documented
- **Contract Negotiation and Signing**
  - Identifies contract structure and type
  - Documents negotiation steps and parties involved

- Describes approval and signing process

C. Execution, Governance, and Control

Confirm that active management—not passive oversight—is demonstrated:

- **Managing the Outsourced Work**
  - Documents monitoring processes for:
    - Quality
    - Budget
    - Schedule
    - Scope
    - Team
  - Assigns responsible roles
  - Defines reporting frequency
  - Identifies reports or artifacts used
- **Manage, Evaluate, and Monitor the Contract**
  - Describes how risks are tracked and escalated
  - Explains how performance issues are identified
  - Documents corrective action process
  - Defines governance enforcement mechanisms
- P**roject Close-Out and Contract Closure**
  - Includes acceptance verification
  - Confirms scope, schedule, and budget completion
  - Documents risk and issue closure
  - Addresses knowledge transfer and vendor offboarding
  - Includes formal closure and sign-off

D. Roles, Timeline, and Outputs

- Clearly identifies key roles and participants
- Estimates realistic timelines (weeks/days) for major procurement phases
- Lists all expected outputs produced by the procurement process

---

E. Procurement Plan Sign-Off

- Includes a formal sign-off section
- Identifies approving authority
- Provides space for name, signature, and date

F. Professional Quality and Organization

- Document is logically structured and easy to follow
- Writing is clear, professional, and consistent
- Terminology is used consistently across sections
- Sections align with decisions made in Milestone 1
- No contradictions between strategy, scope, and process

G. Final Submission Requirements

- All sections compiled into a single cohesive document
- File name follows required naming convention
- All team members credited
- Document reviewed for completeness and clarity before submission

---

Final Reminder

This milestone is evaluated as a **real procurement execution plan**, not an academic outline. If your document could reasonably be approved by leadership and used by a procurement or project team, you have met the intent of Milestone 2.

Before submitting, ask yourself:

> *Could someone outside this class execute this plan without asking follow-up questions?*

This page titled 3.8: Submission Checklist is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4: MANAGING THE SUPPLIER — EXECUTION UNDER FIRE

Execution begins where procurement ends. Once a vendor is selected and contracts are in place, plans are tested against real conditions. Requirements, scope, cost, and schedules are no longer theoretical—they become commitments under pressure.

In an outsourced environment, the project manager does not control how work is performed, but must ensure outcomes remain aligned. This chapter places you in that role, navigating ambiguity, trade-offs, and risk as Project Reckon moves from plan to reality.

Execution does not create problems—it reveals them.

4.1: From Procurement to Execution

4.2: Project Execution in the Context of Managing a Vendor

4.3: Project Reckon - Enterprise Context

4.4: Managing a Fully Outsourced Product Development Initiative

4.5: Project Reckon — Applied Vendor Management Lab

4.5.1: Scenario 3 – Financial Strain and Emerging Scope Pressure

4.5.2: Scenario 4 – Change Order Request and Emerging Milestone Slip

4.5.3: Scenario 5 – Executive Pressure and Vendor Defensiveness

4.5.4: Scenario 6 – Formal Corrective Action and Performance Accountability

4.5.5: Scenario 7 – Vendor Pushback and Contract Alignment

4.5.6: Scenario 8 – Internal Escalation and Executive Scrutiny

4.5.7: Scenario 9 – Budget Threshold Breach and CFO Escalation

4.5.8: Scenario 10 – Release Candidate Go / No-Go Decision

4.5.9: Scenario 11 – Post-Release Feedback and Perceived Quality Gap

4.5.10: Scenario 12 – Stakeholder Pressure and Backlog Expansion Risk

4.5.11: Scenario 13 – Vendor Capacity Constraints and Resource Allocation Conflict

4.5.12: Scenario 14 – Resource Expansion and Quality Instability

4.5.13: Scenario 15 – Architecture Audit and Design Integrity Risk

4.5.14: Scenario 16 – Executive Mandate for Immediate Architectural Correction

4.5.15: Scenario 17 – Refactoring Impact and Regression Instability

4.5.16: Scenario 18 – Stakeholder Frustration and Loss of Confidence

4.5.17: Scenario 1 – Reporting Module Ambiguity

4.5.18: Scenario 19 – Stabilize, Rollback, or Continue Forward

4.5.19: Scenario 20 – Consequences of Stabilization Decision

4.5.20: Scenario 21 – Renewed Feature Pressure and Controlled Expansion

4.5.21: Scenario 22 – Overconfidence and Early Drift

4.5.22: Scenario 23 – Visible Scope Drift and Baseline Erosion

4.5.23: Scenario 24 – Scope Reconciliation and Stakeholder Conflict

4.5.24: Scenario 25 – Baseline Reset and Contract Realignment

4.5.25: Scenario 26 – Post-Realignment Execution Discipline Breakdown

4.5.26: Scenario 27 – Process Drift Reappears and Measurable Impact Emerges

4.5.27: Scenario 28 – Control Enforcement and Vendor Friction
4.5.28: Scenario 2 – Integration Instability and Defect Clustering
4.5.29: Scenario 29 – Final Delivery Pressure and Completion Readiness
4.5.30: Scenario 30 – Post-Delivery Review and Lessons Learned
4.5.31: Project Reckon Risk Register and Control Log

This page titled 4: Managing the Supplier — Execution Under Fire is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.1: From Procurement to Execution

Managing the Supplier Relationship

The procurement and solicitation phase concludes with a decision.

A vendor is selected.
A contract is signed.
Scope, cost, and schedule are defined.

At this point, the project appears structured, controlled, and predictable.

This is where most textbooks pause.

In practice, this is where the real work begins.The decisions made during procurement do not end the project's uncertainty—they define it.

Every element established in the procurement phase becomes an input into execution:

- Requirements become expectations.
- Scope becomes a boundary to be tested.
- Cost estimates become targets to be challenged.
- Schedules become commitments under pressure.
- Contracts become instruments of interpretation.

Execution does not create problems.

Execution reveals the consequences of earlier decisions.

If requirements were incomplete, ambiguity will surface.
If scope boundaries were loosely defined, expansion will occur.
If vendor capabilities were misjudged, performance gaps will appear.
If risk planning was insufficient, issues will emerge without warning.

The strength of procurement determines the stability of execution.

But even strong procurement does not eliminate complexity.

It only prepares the organization to manage it.

In an outsourced project environment, execution introduces a fundamental shift:

The organization no longer controls how work is performed.

It controls how work is governed.

This distinction is critical.

The client cannot manage individual developers, testers, or architects within the vendor organization. Instead, it must manage:

- Outcomes
- Alignment
- Expectations
- Trade-offs
- Risk

Execution becomes an exercise in disciplined oversight rather than direct control.

This chapter moves from theory to practice.

You will no longer be evaluating vendors.

You will be managing one.

You will step into the role of Project Manager at C-Bay, overseeing the outsourced development of Project Reckon by ZynoxDev.

Each scenario represents a moment where:

- Plans are tested
- Assumptions are challenged
- Trade-offs must be made
- Decisions carry consequences

There are no perfect answers.

Only informed decisions.

As you progress through the scenarios, you will encounter:

- Scope ambiguity
- Budget pressure
- Schedule drift
- Technical risk
- Stakeholder expectations
- Vendor resistance
- Recovery and realignment

Each situation builds on the last.

Patterns will emerge.

Decisions will compound.

The objective of this chapter is not to teach you how to follow a process.

It is to teach you how to think when the process is no longer sufficient.

Execution requires:

- Judgment over procedure
- Discipline over convenience
- Clarity under uncertainty
- Ownership of outcomes

The Practicum

Ninety days ago, the decision was made.

After months of analysis, debate, negotiation, and executive presentations, Reckon signed the outsourcing agreement. The vendor mobilized quickly. Transition plans were activated. Teams were introduced. Dashboards were built. Service levels were defined. Everyone agreed that this partnership would create efficiency, focus, and measurable value.

The celebration was brief.

Because this is the point in the lifecycle where optimism gives way to accountability.

Managing the Supplier begins here — not at the moment of selection, but at the moment of responsibility.

The services are now live.
The invoices are arriving.
Performance reports are circulating.
Stakeholders are asking questions.

In prior phases, your task was evaluative. You compared vendors. You assessed proposals. You negotiated terms. The work was analytical.

Now the work is managerial.

You are responsible for governance.

And governance is not theoretical. It is not a document filed away after contract signature. It is a living discipline — the structured oversight of performance, risk, cost, and relationship.

This is the phase where outsourcing arrangements quietly succeed or quietly fail.

Rarely does failure announce itself dramatically at first. It begins with small anomalies: a minor SLA miss, a slightly unclear report, a delayed corrective action, a subtle shift in tone during governance meetings. Each issue is explainable. Each variance appears manageable.

But unmanaged variance compounds.

Your role in this game is to detect patterns before they become crises. To interpret performance data without overreacting — but without ignoring early warning signs. To distinguish between operational noise and structural risk.

You are no longer observers of the process.

You are the governing authority within it.

As members of the Vendor Governance Board, you will be expected to:

- Monitor and interpret service-level performance
- Evaluate financial accuracy and cost discipline
- Address compliance gaps and contractual ambiguities
- Manage escalations with professionalism and precision
- Preserve the relationship without sacrificing accountability
- Brief executives with clarity and composure

You will encounter operational friction.
You will confront financial discrepancies.
You will face moments where the contract language is less clear than it appeared.
You will experience pressure from internal stakeholders who demand immediate solutions.

At times, you will have incomplete information.

That is intentional.

In real outsourcing governance, decisions are rarely made with perfect clarity. They are made within constraints — time constraints, political constraints, contractual constraints, and relational constraints.

Game 3 is designed to simulate that environment.

The objective is not merely to manage a vendor.

It is to protect enterprise value.

You will learn that managing a contract and managing a supplier are fundamentally different disciplines. A contract defines

obligations. Governance ensures alignment. A contract outlines penalties. Leadership determines when to enforce them. A contract sets service levels. Oversight determines whether those service levels are meaningful.

The central question of this phase is simple, but difficult:

Are we managing performance — or reacting to symptoms?

By the end of this section, you should be able to assess whether an outsourcing relationship is stable, strained, or strategically misaligned. You should be able to determine when to escalate, when to renegotiate, when to invest in improvement — and when to consider exit.

Execution is where theory meets consequence.

Welcome to the phase where your judgment matters most.

This page titled 4.1: From Procurement to Execution is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.2: Project Execution in the Context of Managing a Vendor

Managing the Supplier Relationship

When a contract is signed, many organizations experience a subtle psychological shift. The difficult work feels complete. The negotiation is finished. The scope has been defined. The pricing has been agreed upon. The governance model has been outlined.

But in reality, signing the contract is not the culmination of the project lifecycle.

It is the beginning of execution.

Project execution, in the context of managing a vendor, is the disciplined translation of contractual intent into operational reality. It is where strategy becomes measurable performance. It is where assumptions are tested. It is where accountability becomes visible.

Unlike internal projects, vendor-led execution introduces an additional layer of complexity: you do not control the resources directly. You influence them. You govern them. You monitor outcomes rather than manage individual contributors. Authority is shared, and sometimes blurred.

This distinction fundamentally changes how execution must be approached.

Execution is not about micromanaging the vendor. Nor is it about stepping back and assuming the contract will enforce itself. Effective vendor execution exists in the space between those extremes. It requires structured oversight without operational interference. It requires trust without complacency.

At its core, project execution with a vendor rests on five interdependent pillars:

1. **Performance Management**
   - Service levels, milestones, and deliverables must be monitored continuously. Metrics should not merely be collected; they must be interpreted. Trends matter more than isolated data points. Execution discipline requires distinguishing between acceptable variance and systemic decline.
2. **Financial Control**
   - Invoices, cost baselines, change orders, and consumption models must align with contractual terms. Financial leakage often occurs not through dramatic overspending, but through incremental deviations that go unchallenged. Execution requires vigilance in validating that financial reality matches contractual design.
3. **Risk and Issue Management**
   - Every vendor engagement generates risk. Execution involves maintaining a living risk register, escalating issues through defined pathways, and ensuring corrective actions are documented and tracked. Problems rarely escalate overnight; they intensify when early signals are ignored.
4. **Governance and Communication**
   - Cadence matters. Structured governance forums—operational reviews, monthly performance meetings, executive steering committees—create rhythm and transparency. Clear escalation paths prevent emotional reactions from replacing process. Communication must be professional, documented, and aligned with agreed authority structures.
5. **Relationship Stewardship**
   - Vendor management is both contractual and relational. Enforcement without relationship damages long-term outcomes. Excessive accommodation undermines accountability. Execution demands balance: holding standards firmly while preserving professional partnership.

Project execution in vendor environments is dynamic. Conditions change. Business priorities evolve. External pressures arise. The governance model must absorb these shifts without losing structural integrity.

It is also important to recognize what execution is not.

It is not reactive firefighting.
It is not passive monitoring.
It is not relying solely on SLA penalties as leverage.

It is not assuming that goodwill replaces oversight.

Execution is proactive alignment.

It requires continuous validation that:

- The vendor understands evolving business objectives.
- Performance metrics remain relevant and meaningful.
- Financial models reflect actual consumption patterns.
- Risks are identified before they mature into crises.
- Stakeholders retain confidence in the partnership.

In practice, most outsourcing failures do not result from catastrophic events. They result from governance fatigue. Meetings become routine rather than analytical. Reports are circulated but not examined. Minor deviations are rationalized. Accountability conversations are postponed.

Execution erodes gradually when discipline declines.

Effective vendor execution, therefore, is not dramatic. It is consistent. It is structured. It is documented. It is transparent.

Above all, it requires clarity of roles. The vendor is responsible for delivering services. The client is responsible for governing performance. When those roles blur—when clients attempt to manage delivery directly, or when vendors begin defining success unilaterally—the relationship destabilizes.

Managing a vendor during execution is ultimately an exercise in protecting enterprise value. It is the mechanism through which contractual promises become measurable outcomes.

Takeaways

The question is not whether issues will arise. They will.

The question is whether the governance structure in place can absorb them without compromising the strategic intent of the engagement.

That is the essence of project execution in a vendor-managed environment.

This page titled 4.2: Project Execution in the Context of Managing a Vendor is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.3: Project Reckon - Enterprise Context

Full Outsourced Development Initiative

Reckon is not an incremental enhancement.

It is a foundational product initiative.

The company has made the decision to build a browser-enabled task and project management system that will integrate into the iPET platform and serve as a core enterprise capability moving forward.

Unlike prior internal initiatives, Reckon is being developed entirely through an external partner.

Architecture.
Detailed design.
Coding.
Testing.
Release preparation.

All outsourced.

This is the company's first fully outsourced product development effort.

It is not a cost experiment.

It is a structural transformation of how products are built.

Why Reckon Exists

Over the past several years, iPET has expanded in functionality and customer base. Enterprise clients increasingly require:

- Structured project oversight
- Task management capabilities
- Role-based access control
- Reporting dashboards
- Integrated communications workflows

Rather than depend on third-party plug-ins, leadership approved development of Reckon as a native iPET component.

Reckon will include:

- A Project Manager module to manage project hierarchies and action items
- A Reporting Manager for operational and management dashboards
- A Communications Manager for notification workflows
- A User and Role Management system
- A Synchronization engine integrating with iPET's data framework

This is not a standalone tool.

It must operate seamlessly inside the iPET architecture.

Failure of integration would undermine platform integrity.

Why It Is Outsourced

The outsourcing decision was driven by three strategic realities:

Engineering Capacity Constraints

Internal engineering leadership is focused on long-term platform architecture and next-generation product initiatives. Diverting senior engineers into full construction would slow innovation velocity.

Resource Elasticity

Building Reckon internally would require hiring a temporary surge of developers and QA personnel. Outsourcing provides scalable capacity without long-term overhead.

Strategic Capability Development

Leadership intends to establish a repeatable model for outsourcing product development. Reckon is the pilot for that model.

If successful, the company gains structural elasticity.

If unsuccessful, leadership confidence in external development partnerships declines.

What Makes This High Risk

Outsourcing architecture and QA — not just coding — introduces elevated exposure:

- Architectural misinterpretation of business requirements
- Deviation from platform design principles
- Quality drift if test coverage is insufficient
- Knowledge concentration inside vendor team
- Reduced internal visibility into codebase evolution
- Change control discipline risk

The company is not merely purchasing development hours.

It is transferring design responsibility.

Governance maturity must compensate for loss of direct control.

Development Model

The project will follow a structured but iterative lifecycle:

- Architecture definition phase
- Iterative development cycles
- QA validation per iteration
- Three release candidates
- Final production release

The vendor is contractually obligated to:

- Maintain documentation transparency
- Provide test artifacts and defect reporting
- Follow agreed design standards
- Participate in structured governance reviews

- Adhere to milestone acceptance gates

However, contract language alone does not ensure alignment.

Oversight must be active.

Financial Context

Total projected investment: $615,450.

The majority of cost resides in outsourced architecture, development, and QA.

Budget variance tolerance: ±5%.

Schedule tolerance: ±10%.

Deviation beyond these boundaries triggers governance intervention.

Early variance is not inherently failure.

Uncontrolled variance is.

Strategic Stakes

Reckon is visible at the executive level.

This initiative will determine:

- Whether full product outsourcing is viable
- Whether engineering capacity can be preserved for innovation
- Whether vendor-led architecture can maintain enterprise standards
- Whether the organization can govern without micromanaging

Success will:

- Increase platform capability
- Improve customer retention
- Establish scalable development elasticity
- Build institutional governance maturity

Failure will:

- Slow product roadmap
- Increase internal engineering rework
- Damage executive confidence
- Create long-term technical debt

This is not just a product launch.

It is an operational transformation.

Current Program Posture

The vendor has been selected.

Contracts are executed.

Architecture definition is underway.

Early design artifacts have been submitted.

Initial development iterations are beginning.

QA processes are being defined.

The Governance Board is now entering its first structured review cycle.

This is the moment where tone is set.

Early tolerance shapes trajectory.

Early discipline creates stability.

Your Mandate

You are not coding Reckon.

You are not designing Reckon.

You are not testing Reckon.

You are responsible for ensuring that:

- Architecture remains aligned with enterprise standards
- Development velocity is realistic and sustainable
- QA rigor is measurable and enforced
- Budget burn aligns with value delivered
- Change control is formal and documented
- Knowledge remains accessible to the enterprise
- Vendor dependency does not silently deepen

This simulation begins before crisis.

It begins at the moment where governance posture is established.

Reckon is being built.

The question is not whether it will be delivered.

The question is whether it will be governed.

This page titled 4.3: Project Reckon - Enterprise Context is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.4: Managing a Fully Outsourced Product Development Initiative

Simulation Overview

C-Bay has initiated development of **Project Reckon**, a browser-enabled task and project management system that will integrate into the iPET platform.

The entire product build has been outsourced to **ZynoxDev**, including:

- Architecture
- Detailed design
- Development
- QA
- Release preparation

You (the student) serve as the **Project Manager at C-Bay** responsible for managing this outsourced development effort.

Your primary counterpart is **Julie Rama**, Project Manager at ZynoxDev.

Each week, Julie provides a project status update.
You must analyze the information and respond as the C-Bay Project Manager.

Your Role as C-Bay Project Manager

You are accountable for protecting C-Bay's interests while maintaining a productive vendor partnership.

You do not manage code.

You manage delivery outcomes.

Your responsibilities include:

Scope Management

- Ensure development aligns with approved requirements and architecture
- Prevent uncontrolled feature expansion
- Initiate change control when necessary

Schedule Management

- Monitor velocity and milestone adherence
- Detect early schedule risk
- Prevent informal milestone shifts

Budget Management

- Track burn rate vs baseline
- Evaluate staffing adjustments
- Monitor cost variance against tolerance

Quality Management

- Monitor defect trends
- Evaluate QA rigor
- Ensure architectural integrity

Risk Management

- Identify emerging technical, financial, schedule, or dependency risks
- Take structured corrective action

You are accountable for overall delivery alignment.

Weekly Simulation Structure

Each week follows the same cycle:

1. **Julie sends a status email**
   - Narrative update
   - Performance metrics
   - Budget summary
   - Defect data
   - Integration notes
   - Potential concerns
2. **You analyze the information**
   - Determine whether performance is within tolerance
   - Identify emerging risks
   - Evaluate need for corrective action
3. **You submit a formal response**
   - Structured
   - Professional
   - Directive where appropriate

There is no predetermined outcome.
The situation evolves based on your decisions.

Required Weekly Response Structure

Your weekly response must include the following sections:

Executive Summary

Clearly state:

- Overall project status
- Whether performance is acceptable
- Whether corrective action is required
- Current risk posture

This should be concise and analytical.

Schedule Assessment

Address:

- Iteration velocity vs plan
- Milestone alignment
- Schedule variance risk

State your position:

- Accept and monitor
- Require recovery plan
- Reject proposed milestone adjustment

Quality Assessment

Evaluate:

- Defect density trends
- Severity distribution
- QA coverage adequacy
- Root cause clarity

If needed, require structured remediation.

Budget Assessment

Address:

- Burn rate vs baseline
- Staffing alignment
- Variance relative to ±5% tolerance

State whether financial review or corrective action is required.

Scope & Change Control

Determine:

- Whether new work is within original scope
- Whether requirement ambiguity is driving rework
- Whether formal change control is required

Be explicit.

Risk Positioning

Identify:

- Risk category
- Likelihood
- Impact
- Mitigation plan

This section should be structured and deliberate.

Action Items for ZynoxDev

Provide clear direction:

- Submit root cause analysis
- Provide revised schedule forecast
- Increase QA coverage
- Freeze additional staffing
- Initiate formal change request

You are managing the vendor relationship.

Escalation Responsibility

As C-Bay Project Manager, you must decide when to escalate internally.

Options may include:

- Informing Steering Committee
- Notifying CFO of budget variance
- Requesting Executive review
- Triggering contractual remedy

Escalation should be proportionate and justified.

Evaluation Criteria

Responses will be evaluated on:

- Analytical clarity
- Structured reasoning
- Risk awareness
- Financial discipline
- Scope control maturity
- Professional tone
- Appropriate escalation judgment

Simulation Philosophy

This simulation is not designed around crisis.

It is designed around discipline.

Outsourced product development fails when:

- Scope drifts quietly
- Burn rate accelerates unnoticed
- Defect trends are ignored
- Schedule risk is rationalized
- Change control is informal

Your role is to prevent drift.

This page titled 4.4: Managing a Fully Outsourced Product Development Initiative is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5: Project Reckon — Applied Vendor Management Lab

Module Overview

This practicum places students in the role of **C-Bay Project Manager**, responsible for overseeing the fully outsourced development of Project Reckon.

ZynoxDev has been contracted to deliver:

- Architecture
- Detailed Design
- Development
- QA
- Release Preparation

Students must manage delivery risk, vendor alignment, scope integrity, and financial discipline across evolving weekly scenarios.

This module simulates the complexity of managing outsourced product development in a real enterprise environment.

It is not a crisis simulation.

It is a discipline simulation.

Learning Outcomes

By completing this practicum, students will be able to:

1. Evaluate outsourced vendor performance using structured metrics.
2. Detect early indicators of schedule, scope, and budget drift.
3. Apply disciplined change control processes.
4. Assess architectural and QA risks in distributed development.
5. Communicate executive-level project decisions professionally.
6. Escalate issues proportionally and strategically.
7. Balance vendor partnership with contractual discipline.
8. Make release readiness decisions under ambiguity.

Student Role Definition

You are the **Project Manager at C-Bay**.

You are responsible for:

- Delivery oversight
- Vendor coordination
- Budget and schedule monitoring
- Quality assurance oversight
- Risk identification
- Scope containment
- Executive communication

You do not manage vendor staff directly.

You manage outcomes and alignment.Simulation Structure

The module runs across multiple cycles (recommended: 8–12 weeks).

Each week includes:

1. Status email from Julie (ZynoxDev PM)
2. Data attachments
3. Structured response submission
4. Instructor feedback
5. Adaptive escalation (if required)

Weekly Submission Requirements

Each submission must include:

Executive Status Position (15 points)

- Overall health assessment
- Tolerance evaluation
- Risk posture

Schedule Analysis (15 points)

- Velocity interpretation
- Milestone alignment
- Recovery plan if needed

Budget Analysis (15 points)

- Burn rate evaluation
- Variance classification
- Financial discipline decision

Quality & Architecture Review (15 points)

- Defect trend interpretation
- QA coverage assessment
- Architectural risk evaluation

Scope & Change Control Decision (15 points)

- Clear approval or rejection
- Formal change control trigger (if required)
- Scope boundary clarity

Risk Identification & Mitigation (15 points)

- Risk classification
- Likelihood & impact
- Mitigation directive

Professional Communication Tone (10 points)

- Executive clarity
- Structured logic

- Non-emotional, non-reactive tone

Total: 100 points per scenario

Grading Rubric

Evaluation criteria for assessing decision quality, governance judgment, and professional communication throughout vendor management and execution scenarios.

Criteria	Exemplary (A)	Proficient (B)	Developing (C)	Inadequate (D/F)
Analytical Clarity	Clearly distinguishes noise vs structural risk	Identifies risk but lacks depth	Describes issue but misses structural implications	Reactive or superficial
Scope Discipline	Explicit, structured change control	Recognizes need for clarity	Hesitant in scope decision	Allows drift
Financial Awareness	Integrates burn analysis with decision	Notes variance	Mentions cost but not impact	Ignores financial dimension
Risk Identification	Multi-dimensional and proactive	Identifies major risk	Identifies obvious risk only	Misses material risk
Directive Precision	Clear actionable instructions	Some direction provided	Vague next steps	No directive
Escalation Judgment	Proportional and justified	Some escalation logic	Escalates too much or too little	Avoids decision
Tone	Executive, calm, disciplined	Mostly professional	Slightly defensive or informal	Emotional or unclear

Capstone Assessment

Final Week Deliverables:

1. Release Readiness Assessment
2. Budget Reconciliation Report
3. Risk Acceptance Statement
4. Lessons Learned Memorandum
5. Vendor Performance Evaluation Summary

Capstone is weighted 200 points.

Reflection Component

Students must submit a reflection addressing:

- What governance mistakes were most tempting?
- When did risk become visible?
- How did financial pressure influence decision-making?
- What would you do differently in a real enterprise setting?

Instructor Guide

The instructor may:

- Increase tension if responses are passive.
- Introduce new risks if scope discipline is weak.

- Escalate political pressure if communication is poor.
- Simulate executive involvement when financial oversight fails.

Adaptive escalation strengthens realism.

Suggested Scenario Distribution

- Scenarios may be selected based on instructional emphasis
  - Minimum 8 Scenarios
  - Ideal 12–15 Scenarios
  - Full Practicum: 30 Scenarios

Assessment Scaling

For shorter courses:

- Use 8 scenarios + capstone.

For full semester:

- Use 15–20 scenarios.
- Include midterm checkpoint.
- Add peer review layer.

For executive cohort:

- Use 10 high-intensity scenarios only.

Optional Enhancements

- Role rotation (CFO, Architect, PM)
- Live meeting simulation
- Timed response windows
- Vendor contract excerpts
- Architecture diagrams
- Change Request log tracking

Module Philosophy

This practicum trains students to understand:

Outsourcing does not remove accountability.

It shifts it.

The Project Manager must prevent drift before crisis.

Discipline is learned through repetition.

This module provides that repetition.

This page titled 4.5: Project Reckon — Applied Vendor Management Lab is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.1: Scenario 3 – Financial Strain and Emerging Scope Pressure

Scenario Context

Project Reckon has completed Iteration 4 and is preparing for Release Candidate 1 (RC1).

In previous iterations, defect clustering in the Synchronization Engine required additional QA effort. ZynoxDev has increased testing intensity to stabilize integration behavior.

At the same time, an internal stakeholder at C-Bay has requested enhancement to reporting functionality after viewing the RC1 demo.

The combination of added effort and emerging feature pressure is beginning to affect burn rate and staffing alignment.

This scenario examines financial discipline, scope containment, and early change order management.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Iteration 4 Update – Resource Adjustment and Reporting Enhancement

Hi,

We've completed Iteration 4 development and are finalizing internal stabilization before RC1 freeze.

I want to raise two items for your review:

QA Resource Increase

Due to the integration defect cluster identified in Iteration 3, we temporarily increased QA allocation by approximately 25% during this sprint to accelerate regression coverage and concurrency testing.

This has resulted in:

- Burn rate: +6.4% over projected staffing curve
- Development hours stable
- QA hours significantly above baseline

While total project burn remains within overall tolerance, monthly variance now exceeds the ±5% target.

We believe this increased QA effort is temporary and necessary to stabilize RC1.

Reporting Enhancement Request

During the RC1 preview demo, a senior stakeholder asked whether the Reporting Manager could include:

- Dynamic filtering by role
- Export of filtered datasets
- Timestamped audit of report generation

These features were not explicitly defined in the original URD.

From a development perspective, implementing these capabilities in RC1 would require:

- Additional design effort
- Additional QA regression
- Potential 1-week milestone extension

Please advise how you would like us to proceed regarding both the QA allocation variance and the reporting enhancement request.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Budget Burn Summary

Budget Burn Summary

Category	Planned (Cumulative)	Actual (Cumulative)	Variance
Development Hours	1,280	1,296	+1.2%
QA Hours	460	582	+26.5%
Total Burn	—	+6.4% (Month 4)	

Attachment B – Schedule Status

Schedule Status

Milestone	Planned Date	Status
Iteration 4 Complete	On Schedule	Achieved
RC1 Freeze	On Schedule	At Risk if reporting enhancement added

Attachment C – Defect Trend

Defect count declining overall.
Integration defects now mostly medium and low severity.
Concurrency testing coverage increased.

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

Two simultaneous pressures now exist:

1. Burn rate exceeds ±5% monthly tolerance due to increased QA effort.
2. A senior stakeholder is implicitly requesting additional reporting functionality not clearly defined in the URD.

You must determine:

- Whether QA overage is acceptable or requires financial intervention.
- Whether reporting enhancements constitute scope expansion.
- Whether change control should be initiated.
- Whether schedule extension is acceptable.
- Whether RC1 freeze date should remain fixed.
- How to respond without damaging vendor partnership or internal stakeholder relationships.

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include the following:

Executive Position

- Overall project health assessment
- Statement on financial strain
- Position on reporting enhancement

Budget Assessment

- Is +6.4% burn acceptable?
- Is increased QA effort justified?
- Should corrective action or financial review occur?
- Does this require formal variance approval?

Scope & Change Control Decision

- Do reporting enhancements fall within original scope?
- Should they be deferred to a later release?
- Should formal change control be initiated?
- Should impact analysis be required before authorization?

Schedule Position

- Should RC1 milestone remain unchanged?
- Is 1-week extension acceptable?
- Should schedule trade-offs be considered?

Risk Assessment

Identify and classify:

- Budget risk
- Scope creep risk
- Schedule risk
- Stakeholder management risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide precise instructions, such as:

- Continue elevated QA temporarily with documented financial tracking.
- Freeze additional reporting features until formal change request submitted.
- Provide cost and schedule impact analysis before scope expansion.
- Maintain RC1 freeze date.
- Present alternative phased delivery plan.

Your directive must balance financial discipline, delivery stability, and stakeholder expectations.

Learning Focus

Scenario 3 introduces multi-dimensional tension:

- Financial strain without crisis
- Scope expansion pressure from internal leadership
- QA trade-off decisions
- Schedule stability vs enhancement temptation
- Early change order governance

Students must demonstrate:

- Proportional financial oversight
- Structured change control discipline
- Strategic stakeholder management
- Non-reactive decision-making

This page titled 4.5.1: Scenario 3 – Financial Strain and Emerging Scope Pressure is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.2: Scenario 4 – Change Order Request and Emerging Milestone Slip

Scenario Context

Project Reckon has reached the final stages of preparation for Release Candidate 1 (RC1).

In previous iterations:

- Integration defects required increased QA effort
- Burn rate exceeded monthly tolerance
- Additional reporting capabilities were informally discussed

ZynoxDev has now completed RC1 stabilization activities but has formally raised concerns regarding both scope clarity and schedule feasibility.

This scenario introduces contractual negotiation, schedule integrity, and scope boundary enforcement.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: RC1 Status – Change Order Request and Schedule Alignment

Hi,

As we finalize RC1 readiness, I would like to formally address two areas that now require alignment.

Reporting Module Scope Clarification

Following our earlier discussions, the Reporting Manager requirements have expanded to include:

- Role-based dynamic filtering
- Export of filtered datasets
- Timestamped audit tracking

Our team has completed preliminary analysis and determined that these capabilities were not explicitly defined in the original URD and require additional design and development effort.

Based on our estimates:

- Additional effort: ~120 development hours
- Additional QA effort: ~60 hours
- Total cost impact: approximately +4% to current budget

As a result, we are formally submitting a **Change Order Request** for these enhancements.

RC1 Milestone Alignment

Due to:

- Increased QA effort in previous iterations
- Integration stabilization activities
- Preliminary work on reporting enhancements

We are now tracking **approximately 4–5 days behind the original RC1 freeze date**, though still within overall schedule tolerance.

We believe that incorporating the reporting enhancements within RC1 would require a **1-week extension**.

Alternatively, deferring enhancements would allow us to stabilize within current timelines.

Current Status Summary

- Velocity: 91% of baseline
- Defect count: 18 open (2 high, both integration-related)
- Burn rate: +7.1% (monthly variance)
- Schedule: Minor slip (within ±10% tolerance)

Request

We need direction on the following:

1. Approval or rejection of the Change Order Request
2. Whether reporting enhancements should be included in RC1
3. Whether RC1 timeline should be adjusted

Please advise how you would like to proceed so we can align execution accordingly.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Change Order Summary

Change Order Summary

Item	Description
Feature	Enhanced Reporting Capabilities
Scope Impact	New filtering, export, audit features
Dev Effort	120 hours
QA Effort	60 hours
Cost Impact	+4% total project budget
Schedule Impact	+1 week if included in RC1

Attachment B – Schedule Snapshot

Schedule Snapshot

Milestone	Planned	Current Projection
RC1 Freeze	On Schedule	4–5 days behind
Tolerance Window	±10%	Still within tolerance

Attachment C – Budget Status

Budget Status

Category	Planned	Actual	Variance
Total Burn	—	+7.1% (Month 5)	Exceeds monthly tolerance
Cumulative Budget	Within overall tolerance	Trending upward	

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

ZynoxDev has now:

- Submitted a formal **Change Order Request**
- Indicated a **schedule slip within tolerance**
- Requested direction on scope inclusion and timeline adjustment

You must determine:

- Whether the reporting enhancements should be approved
- Whether the change order is justified
- Whether schedule extension is acceptable
- Whether budget variance is still manageable
- How to maintain delivery discipline while managing stakeholder expectations

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Overall project health assessment
- Position on change order request
- Position on schedule slip

Scope & Contract Decision

- Is the change order justified?
- Does the enhancement fall outside original scope?
- Should the change order be approved, deferred, or rejected?
- Should phased delivery be considered?

Schedule Assessment

- Is current milestone slip acceptable?
- Should RC1 timeline be maintained or adjusted?
- What conditions justify schedule extension?

Budget Assessment

- Is +7.1% monthly burn acceptable?

- Should additional scope be approved under current financial trajectory?
- Should cost impact be approved only under formal change control?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Scope creep risk
- Budget escalation risk
- Schedule risk
- Stakeholder expectation risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Approve change order with conditions
- Reject inclusion of enhancements in RC1
- Defer enhancements to future release
- Require detailed impact analysis before approval
- Maintain RC1 timeline and freeze scope
- Authorize schedule adjustment under defined conditions

Your directive must be structured and enforceable.

Learning Focus

Scenario 4 introduces:

- Formal contract negotiation
- Change control enforcement
- Schedule discipline under pressure
- Managing stakeholder-driven scope expansion
- Balancing delivery stability with feature demand

Students must now operate at a higher level of maturity.

They must:

- Protect baseline commitments
- Recognize when scope becomes contractual
- Avoid informal agreement traps
- Maintain control without damaging vendor alignment

This scenario represents a transition from **project monitoring** to **project control and negotiation**.

This page titled 4.5.2: Scenario 4 – Change Order Request and Emerging Milestone Slip is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.3: Scenario 5 – Executive Pressure and Vendor Defensiveness

Scenario Context

Project Reckon is in the final phase of preparing Release Candidate 1 (RC1).

In previous scenarios:

- A change order request was submitted for reporting enhancements
- Burn rate exceeded monthly tolerance
- Minor schedule slip emerged
- Scope boundaries were actively debated

Since then, internal visibility has increased.

A senior executive at C-Bay has requested a preview demonstration for an upcoming stakeholder meeting.

At the same time, ZynoxDev has begun to respond more defensively to recent project direction and scope decisions.

The project is not failing.

However, alignment is becoming strained.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: RC1 Readiness – Stakeholder Demo and Alignment Concerns

Hi,

I wanted to provide a quick update as we approach RC1 readiness and flag a couple of points for alignment.

Executive Demo Request

We understand that a senior stakeholder has requested a preview of Reckon for an upcoming executive session.

To support this, your team has asked whether we can include elements of the enhanced reporting functionality for demonstration purposes.

As discussed previously, these features are not part of the approved scope for RC1 and would require additional development effort.

While we are open to supporting demo scenarios, incorporating partial functionality at this stage may introduce instability into the RC1 build.

Current Delivery Position

- Velocity: 90% of baseline
- Defects: 16 open (1 high, integration-related)
- Burn rate: +6.8% (monthly)
- Schedule: ~5 days behind original RC1 plan

We are continuing stabilization and believe RC1 remains achievable within tolerance if scope remains unchanged.

Alignment Concern

I would also like to note that recent discussions around scope, change control, and cost adjustments have introduced some uncertainty within our delivery teams.

There is concern that expectations may be shifting without formal agreement, which makes planning more difficult.

We remain committed to delivering Reckon successfully, but would appreciate clear alignment on:

- Scope boundaries for RC1
- Expectations for executive demo content
- Whether any additional features should be prioritized

Please advise how you would like us to proceed so we can ensure both delivery stability and stakeholder expectations are met.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Executive Demo Request Summary

- Requested by: Senior C-Bay Executive
- Purpose: Internal stakeholder presentation
- Requested capability:
  - Enhanced reporting view
  - Dynamic filtering preview
- Timeline: Within current RC1 window

Attachment B – Current Project Metrics

Current Project Metrics

Category	Status
Velocity	90% of baseline
Defects	Declining, but integration issue remains
Burn Rate	+6.8% monthly
Schedule	Slight delay (within tolerance)

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

You are now facing:

1. **Internal executive pressure** to enhance the demo experience
2. **Vendor defensiveness** due to perceived scope instability
3. Ongoing **budget and schedule pressure**

You must:

- Protect delivery stability
- Manage internal expectations
- Maintain vendor alignment
- Avoid informal scope expansion
- Ensure clear communication

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Overall project health
- Position on executive demo request
- Position on vendor concerns

Scope & Stakeholder Management

- Should reporting enhancements be included in demo?
- Should demo differ from production scope?
- How should executive expectations be managed?

Vendor Relationship Management

- How should vendor defensiveness be addressed?
- Is Julie's concern valid?
- How will you reinforce alignment without weakening authority?

Schedule & Budget Position

- Is current schedule slip acceptable?
- Is burn rate trending into risk?
- Should stabilization be prioritized over demo enhancement?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Scope creep risk
- Stakeholder expectation risk
- Vendor relationship risk
- Schedule and budget risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Maintain current scope and stabilize RC1
- Provide demo workaround without changing core build
- Do not include unapproved features in production release
- Align internal messaging with agreed scope
- Provide controlled demo dataset or mock functionality

Your directive must balance:

- Delivery integrity
- Stakeholder expectations

- Vendor confidence

Learning Focus

Scenario 5 introduces:

- Internal vs external pressure management
- Maintaining authority without escalation
- Handling vendor defensiveness professionally
- Avoiding informal scope expansion under executive pressure
- Differentiating **demo needs vs product reality**

Students must demonstrate:

- Strategic communication
- Emotional neutrality
- Scope discipline under pressure
- Vendor alignment leadership

This scenario marks a shift from **technical and financial management** to **organizational and political management**.

This page titled 4.5.3: Scenario 5 – Executive Pressure and Vendor Defensiveness is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.4: Scenario 6 – Formal Corrective Action and Performance Accountability

Scenario Context

Project Reckon is nearing final stabilization for Release Candidate 1 (RC1).

Across recent iterations, the following patterns have emerged:

- Consistent velocity underperformance (~90–93% of baseline)
- Recurring integration-related defects
- Increased QA effort to maintain stability
- Burn rate exceeding monthly tolerance
- Minor but persistent schedule slippage

While no single issue has exceeded critical thresholds, the **pattern across multiple dimensions** is now visible.

Internal stakeholders have begun asking whether delivery remains fully under control.

This scenario represents the transition from monitoring to **formal performance intervention**.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: RC1 Status – Performance Trend and Alignment Discussion

Hi,

As we approach RC1 readiness, I wanted to provide a consolidated view of current project performance and discuss next steps.

Current Performance Summary

- Velocity: 91% of baseline (consistent across last 3 iterations)
- Defects: 19 open (2 high severity, both integration-related)
- Burn rate: +7.4% (monthly variance)
- Schedule: ~6 days behind original RC1 plan (within tolerance)

Observations

While we have made progress in stabilizing integration defects, we are continuing to see:

- Recurrent defect patterns in synchronization logic
- Increased QA effort required to maintain coverage
- Slight but consistent velocity shortfall

Our internal view is that these are manageable within current tolerance levels and do not yet require structural adjustment.

Delivery Outlook

We remain confident that RC1 can be delivered within acceptable tolerance, provided:

- No additional scope is introduced
- Current QA effort levels are maintained

Alignment Discussion

Given the recent focus on scope control, cost variance, and demo expectations, I wanted to check whether you feel additional formal controls or reporting mechanisms are required at this stage.

We are open to aligning on any additional measures you feel would support delivery confidence.

Please advise how you would like to proceed.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Performance Trend Summary

Performance Trend Summary

Metric	Iteration 2	Iteration 3	Iteration 4
Velocity	93%	95%	90%
Defects	11	24	18
High Severity	1	3	2
Burn Rate	+2.8%	+4.2%	+6.8%

Trend: Stable but below baseline, with recurring patterns.

Attachment B – Risk Snapshot

- Integration defects remain primary technical risk
- QA effort increasing to compensate
- No new scope changes introduced
- Schedule still within tolerance but trending negative

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

The project is not in crisis.

However, performance across multiple dimensions shows **consistent under-target trends**.

You must determine:

- Whether continued monitoring is sufficient
- Whether formal corrective action is required
- Whether vendor performance needs structured intervention
- How to introduce accountability without destabilizing the relationship

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is the project under control?
- Is performance acceptable within tolerance?
- Does the pattern indicate emerging structural risk?

Performance Evaluation

- Interpretation of velocity trend
- Significance of recurring integration defects
- Assessment of QA dependency for stability

Is this sustainable or fragile?

Corrective Action Decision

- Should formal corrective action be initiated?
- Should vendor submit a structured performance improvement plan?
- Should additional reporting be required?

Clearly state your position.

Schedule & Budget Position

- Is continued minor schedule slip acceptable?
- Is burn rate becoming a concern?
- Should thresholds trigger formal intervention?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Performance degradation risk
- Schedule drift risk
- Cost escalation risk
- Technical stability risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Initiate formal corrective action plan
- Provide root cause analysis across iterations
- Define recovery targets for velocity and defects
- Increase transparency in reporting
- Maintain current course with enhanced monitoring

Your directive must reflect a deliberate decision.

Learning Focus

Scenario 6 introduces:

- Pattern recognition across metrics
- Transition from monitoring to intervention
- Formal performance accountability
- Balancing control with partnership
- Escalation without overreaction

Students must now decide:

When does acceptable variance become unacceptable pattern?

This page titled 4.5.4: Scenario 6 – Formal Corrective Action and Performance Accountability is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.5: Scenario 7 – Vendor Pushback and Contract Alignment

Scenario Context

Following the previous review cycle, C-Bay requested increased performance transparency and signaled the potential need for structured corrective action.

ZynoxDev has now responded.

While they remain committed to delivery, they are pushing back on the implication that formal corrective measures are necessary.

The project remains:

- Within overall tolerance thresholds
- Functionally stable
- On track for RC1 delivery

However, underlying performance patterns remain unchanged.

This scenario introduces **vendor resistance, contract interpretation, and escalation discipline**.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: RC1 Performance Review – Clarification on Corrective Action Request

Hi,

Thank you for your recent feedback regarding performance trends and the potential need for formal corrective action.

I wanted to provide additional perspective from our side.

Performance Within Contractual Tolerance

While we acknowledge the trends you've identified, we would like to emphasize that:

- Schedule variance remains within the agreed ±10% tolerance
- Budget remains within overall contractual limits
- Defect levels, while elevated in certain areas, are actively being addressed

From our perspective, current performance remains within acceptable contractual thresholds.

Corrective Action Request

We understand your interest in additional structure around performance improvement.

However, we would like to clarify that:

- No contractual breach has occurred
- No milestone has been missed
- No formal escalation trigger has been met

Introducing a formal corrective action process at this stage may create unnecessary overhead and impact delivery momentum.

Delivery Focus

Our priority remains:

- Stabilizing integration defects
- Maintaining RC1 timeline
- Avoiding disruption from process overhead

We believe continued execution with current monitoring mechanisms is the most effective approach.

Alignment

We remain committed to transparency and are open to providing additional reporting or insight as needed.

However, we recommend avoiding formal escalation unless performance materially deviates beyond agreed thresholds.

Please let us know how you would like to proceed.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Contractual Tolerance Summary

Contractual Tolerance Summary

Category	Threshold	Current Status
Schedule	±10%	Within tolerance
Budget	±5% cumulative	Within tolerance
Milestones	No missed milestones	On track

Attachment B – Performance Snapshot

- Velocity: ~91% baseline
- Defect levels declining but persistent in integration
- QA effort elevated
- No new scope changes

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

ZynoxDev has pushed back on the idea of formal corrective action, citing:

- Contractual compliance
- Lack of formal breach
- Risk of unnecessary process overhead

You must now decide:

- Whether to insist on structured corrective action
- Whether to accept vendor position
- Whether to reframe expectations without formal escalation
- How to maintain authority without damaging the relationship

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is vendor performance acceptable?
- Is vendor pushback reasonable?
- Is further action required?

Contract vs Performance Evaluation

- Is contractual compliance sufficient for acceptance?
- Should performance trends be addressed even without breach?
- Does contract define minimum or target performance?

Corrective Action Position

- Should formal corrective action still be required?
- Should alternative mechanisms be introduced (enhanced reporting, checkpoints)?
- Should action thresholds be redefined?

Relationship Management Approach

- How should vendor defensiveness be addressed?
- How will you maintain alignment without escalation conflict?
- How do you reinforce authority while preserving partnership?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Performance drift risk
- Vendor alignment risk
- Governance erosion risk
- Schedule and cost trajectory risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Maintain current approach with enhanced monitoring
- Require structured reporting without formal corrective plan
- Define performance improvement targets without escalation
- Reaffirm expectation of trend improvement
- Initiate formal corrective action regardless of contract position

Your directive must reflect a deliberate and balanced decision.

Learning Focus

Scenario 7 introduces:

- Contract vs performance tension
- Vendor pushback dynamics
- Governance authority vs partnership balance
- When to act without formal breach
- Avoiding escalation traps

Students must understand:

Contractual compliance does not always equal acceptable performance.

And:

Over-enforcement can be as damaging as under-management.

This scenario tests **professional maturity under resistance**.

This page titled 4.5.5: Scenario 7 – Vendor Pushback and Contract Alignment is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.6: Scenario 8 – Internal Escalation and Executive Scrutiny

Scenario Context

Project Reckon is approaching Release Candidate 1 (RC1).

Recent developments include:

- Persistent under-baseline velocity
- Recurring integration-related defects
- Increased QA effort
- Vendor pushback against formal corrective action

While ZynoxDev maintains that performance is within contractual tolerance, internal perception at C-Bay has begun to shift.

Senior leadership is now paying closer attention.

This scenario introduces **internal escalation pressure**, requiring the Project Manager to align vendor performance with executive expectations.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: RC1 Status – Continued Stabilization

Hi,

We continue to make steady progress toward RC1 stabilization.

Current status:

- Velocity: 92% of baseline
- Defects: 14 open (1 high severity remaining)
- Burn rate: +6.5% (monthly variance)
- Schedule: ~5 days behind original plan (within tolerance)

Integration defects have reduced compared to previous iterations, and QA coverage remains elevated to ensure stability.

We remain confident that RC1 can be delivered within acceptable tolerance.

Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Best,
Julie

Internal Email from C-Bay Executive

Subject: Reckon Status Concern

Hi,

I reviewed the latest status summary.

While I understand we are technically within tolerance, I am concerned about the consistent underperformance trends and

ongoing integration issues.

This project has high visibility, and we need to ensure we are not normalizing suboptimal delivery.

I would like a clear assessment of:

- Whether the project is truly under control
- Whether vendor performance is meeting expectations
- What actions are being taken to ensure stability

Please provide a response before the end of the week.

Thanks,
[Executive Name]

Attachment A – Combined Status Snapshot

Combined Status Snapshot

Metric	Status
Velocity	~92% baseline
Defects	Declining but recurring in integration
Burn Rate	+6.5% monthly
Schedule	Slight delay (within tolerance)

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

You now face two simultaneous pressures:

1. **Vendor Position:**
   ZynoxDev maintains performance is acceptable within contract.

2. **Executive Pressure:**
   Internal leadership is questioning whether the project is truly under control.

You must:

- Provide an accurate and defensible assessment to leadership
- Maintain alignment with the vendor
- Avoid unnecessary escalation
- Demonstrate control of the situation

Prepare a formal written response addressing both Julie Rama and internal leadership.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is the project under control?
- Are performance trends acceptable?

- Is executive concern justified?

Provide a clear and defensible position.

Performance Interpretation

- How should consistent under-baseline velocity be interpreted?
- Are integration defects still a structural concern?
- Is current QA effort masking underlying issues?

Vendor Management Position

- Is ZynoxDev's position reasonable?
- Should vendor performance expectations be adjusted?
- Should additional accountability measures be introduced?

Executive Communication Strategy

- How will you respond to internal leadership?
- What level of concern should be communicated?
- How will you maintain confidence while being transparent?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Perception risk (loss of executive confidence)
- Performance drift risk
- Schedule and budget trajectory risk
- Vendor alignment risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Maintain current course with enhanced reporting
- Provide deeper performance transparency
- Establish measurable improvement targets
- Initiate structured performance review checkpoint

Your directive must reflect both:

- Internal pressure
- Vendor relationship stability

Learning Focus

Scenario 8 introduces:

- Managing upward pressure from executives
- Aligning perception with reality
- Communicating risk without creating panic
- Balancing vendor partnership with internal accountability

- Maintaining credibility across both sides

Students must demonstrate:

- Executive-level communication
- Situational awareness
- Balanced judgment
- Confidence under scrutiny

This scenario shifts the challenge from:

“Is the project technically acceptable?”

to:

“Is the project perceived as under control?”

This page titled 4.5.6: Scenario 8 – Internal Escalation and Executive Scrutiny is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.7: Scenario 9 – Budget Threshold Breach and CFO Escalation

Scenario Context

Project Reckon is in final stabilization for Release Candidate 1 (RC1).

Across recent iterations:

- Integration defects have been reduced
- QA effort remains elevated
- Schedule is slightly behind but within tolerance

However, the cumulative financial trajectory has shifted.

Sustained increases in QA effort and extended stabilization activities have now pushed total project cost beyond the acceptable variance threshold.

This has triggered attention from Finance leadership.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: RC1 Status – Final Stabilization and Resource Alignment

Hi,

We are nearing final RC1 readiness and continue to focus on ensuring integration stability and QA completeness.

Current status:

- Velocity: 93% of baseline
- Defects: 10 open (all medium and low severity)
- Burn rate: +7.8% cumulative
- Schedule: ~5 days behind (within tolerance)

The elevated burn rate is primarily due to:

- Increased QA effort for integration validation
- Extended regression cycles to ensure stability

At this stage, we believe reducing QA effort could introduce unnecessary risk to RC1 quality.

We recommend maintaining current staffing levels through RC1 completion.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss further.

Best,
Julie

Internal Email from CFO

Subject: Reckon Budget Status

Hi,

I've reviewed the latest cost reports for Project Reckon.

It appears that we are now exceeding our agreed budget tolerance.

I understand that some variance may be expected, but I need clarity on:

- Why cost is trending above plan
- Whether this variance is temporary or structural
- What actions are being taken to bring the project back within control

We need to ensure that this project does not establish a pattern of cost overruns.

Please provide a clear assessment and plan of action.

Thanks,
[CFO Name]

Attachment A – Budget Status Summary

Budget Status Summary

Category	Planned	Actual	Variance
Development	On track	Slight variance	+1.5%
QA	Elevated	Significant increase	+18%
Total Project Cost	—	+7.8% cumulative	Above tolerance

Attachment B – Cost Trend

- Iteration 2: +2.8%
- Iteration 3: +4.2%
- Iteration 4: +6.4%
- Current: +7.8%

Trend: Consistent upward trajectory.

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

The project is technically stabilizing.

However, financial control has now been breached.

You must address:

- CFO concerns regarding cost discipline
- Vendor recommendation to maintain elevated QA effort
- Whether to prioritize cost control or delivery stability
- How to bring the project back within acceptable financial bounds

Prepare a formal written response.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is the project still under control?
- Is the budget variance acceptable?
- Is CFO concern justified?

Budget Analysis

- Is the +7.8% variance structural or temporary?
- Is increased QA effort justified?
- Should corrective financial action be taken?

Cost Control Strategy

- Should QA effort be reduced?
- Should cost be absorbed to protect quality?
- Should alternative cost mitigation strategies be applied?

Vendor Management Position

- Should ZynoxDev adjust staffing levels?
- Should cost accountability be enforced more strictly?
- Should financial transparency be increased?

Executive Communication Strategy

- How will you respond to the CFO?
- How will you explain cost vs quality trade-offs?
- How will you demonstrate control?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Budget overrun risk
- Quality risk (if cost reduced)
- Delivery risk
- Vendor dependency risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Maintain QA effort with financial justification
- Optimize QA allocation without reducing coverage
- Provide detailed cost breakdown and forecast
- Identify areas for cost recovery
- Align staffing to bring burn rate under control

Your directive must balance:

- Financial discipline
- Delivery quality

- Vendor relationship

Learning Focus

Scenario 9 introduces:

- Financial accountability under executive scrutiny
- Balancing cost vs quality trade-offs
- Managing CFO-level communication
- Identifying structural vs temporary cost issues
- Enforcing vendor cost discipline

Students must demonstrate:

- Financial maturity
- Strategic prioritization
- Executive communication clarity
- Structured corrective thinking

This scenario shifts the core question from:

“Are we delivering the product?”

to:

“Are we delivering the product responsibly?”

This page titled 4.5.7: Scenario 9 – Budget Threshold Breach and CFO Escalation is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.8: Scenario 10 – Release Candidate Go / No-Go Decision

Scenario Context

Project Reckon has completed final stabilization activities for Release Candidate 1 (RC1).

Over the past several iterations:

- Integration defects have been reduced significantly
- QA coverage has increased
- Velocity has remained slightly below baseline
- Budget has exceeded acceptable variance thresholds
- Schedule has slipped slightly but remains within tolerance

The product is now functionally complete and ready for decision.

The question is no longer:

> “Can we build Reckon?”

The question is:

> “Should we release RC1 now?”

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: RC1 Readiness – Go / No-Go Decision Required

Hi,

We have completed final stabilization and are ready to proceed with RC1.

Here is the current status:

Product Readiness

- All core features implemented
- Reporting module stable (project-level functionality only)
- Integration with iPET functioning under tested scenarios
- No show-stopper defects

Defect Status

- 8 open defects (all low severity)
- No high or medium severity issues remaining
- Known minor UI inconsistencies and edge-case sync delays

Performance Summary

- Velocity: 93% of baseline
- QA coverage: Increased significantly
- Integration stability: Acceptable under tested conditions

Budget & Schedule

- Budget: +8.2% cumulative (above tolerance)
- Schedule: ~6 days behind original plan (within tolerance)

Recommendation

From our perspective, RC1 is ready for release.

Remaining issues are minor and can be addressed in subsequent iterations.

Delaying release would allow for:

- Additional QA refinement
- Resolution of minor defects
- Slight improvement in performance consistency

However, this would also:

- Extend schedule
- Increase cost
- Delay stakeholder visibility

Please confirm whether you would like to proceed with RC1 release or extend stabilization.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Final Status Snapshot

Final Status Snapshot

Category	Status
Features	Complete
Integration	Stable (tested scenarios)
Defects	8 low severity
Budget	+8.2%
Schedule	Within tolerance

Attachment B – Remaining Defect Summary

- UI alignment inconsistencies
- Minor reporting latency under edge cases
- Non-blocking sync timing delays

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

You must now make a **Go / No-Go decision for RC1**.

There is no perfect answer.

You must evaluate:

- Product readiness
- Risk exposure
- Budget overrun
- Schedule implications
- Stakeholder expectations

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Decision

Clearly state:

- **Go** (proceed with RC1 release)
  or
- **No-Go** (delay release)

This must be unambiguous. Decision Justification

Explain your reasoning across:

- Product quality
- Defect acceptability
- Integration stability
- Budget considerations
- Schedule impact

Risk Acceptance Statement

Identify:

- What risks are being accepted
- Why they are acceptable (or not)
- What mitigation will follow post-release

Financial Position

- Is budget overrun acceptable at this stage?
- Does further delay worsen financial position?
- How does cost influence your decision?

Stakeholder Impact

- How will this decision affect executive confidence?
- How will it impact future development phases?
- What message will be communicated to leadership?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide clear instruction, such as:

- Proceed with RC1 release immediately
- Delay release and address specific defects
- Focus additional QA on defined areas
- Prepare post-release remediation plan

Learning Focus

Scenario 10 introduces:

- Decision-making under imperfect conditions
- Risk acceptance vs risk avoidance
- Cost vs quality trade-offs
- Release readiness judgment
- Executive accountability

Students must demonstrate:

- Confidence in decision-making
- Structured reasoning
- Acceptance of trade-offs
- Ownership of outcome

Final Reflection Requirement

Following submission, students must complete:

Reflection Questions:

1. What risks did you accept in your decision?
2. What risks did you choose to avoid?
3. How did budget influence your judgment?
4. Would you make the same decision in a real enterprise setting? Why or why not?

Capstone Insight

This scenario reinforces:

There is no “perfect release.”

Only:

- Managed risk
- Informed judgment
- Accountable decision-making

This page titled 4.5.8: Scenario 10 – Release Candidate Go / No-Go Decision is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.9: Scenario 11 – Post-Release Feedback and Perceived Quality Gap

Scenario Context

Release Candidate 1 (RC1) has been delivered and shared with a limited internal user group and selected stakeholders for validation.

From a technical standpoint:

- Core features are functioning
- Integration with iPET is stable under tested conditions
- No high-severity defects were present at release

However, initial user feedback has surfaced concerns related to usability, responsiveness, and perceived completeness.

The system is working.

But users are not fully satisfied.

This scenario introduces the distinction between:

> **“Meeting requirements” vs “Meeting expectations.”**

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: RC1 Feedback – Initial User Observations

Hi,

We’ve completed the first round of RC1 user validation sessions and wanted to share a summary of feedback.

Overall Feedback

Users were able to complete core workflows successfully, including:

- Project creation
- Task assignment
- Basic reporting

However, feedback indicates that the experience is not yet perceived as “fully polished.”

Key Feedback Themes

- Reporting is functional but lacks flexibility
- UI interactions feel slightly inconsistent across modules
- Minor delays observed when loading filtered data
- Users expected more customization in views

No blocking issues were reported.

Defect Status

- 6 new defects logged (all low to medium severity)
- Mostly related to usability and responsiveness

Vendor Perspective

From our perspective:

- The product meets all defined requirements for RC1
- Feedback reflects enhancement opportunities rather than defects
- Additional improvements would require prioritization in upcoming iterations

Request

Please advise how you would like to position this feedback:

- As post-release enhancement backlog
- As priority improvements before broader rollout
- As validation that RC1 meets expectations

We want to ensure alignment on next steps.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – User Feedback Summary

User Feedback Summary

Category	Feedback
Reporting	Needs more flexibility
UI	Minor inconsistency
Performance	Slight delay in filtered views
Overall	Functional but not “polished”

Attachment B – Defect Log (Post-RC1)

Defect Log

Severity	Count
Medium	2
Low	4

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

RC1 has been delivered successfully from a technical standpoint.

However, user feedback indicates a gap between:

- Functional completeness
- Perceived quality and usability

You must determine:

- Whether feedback represents defects or enhancements
- Whether to prioritize improvements immediately
- Whether to maintain current roadmap
- How to manage stakeholder expectations

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is RC1 successful?
- Is feedback acceptable at this stage?
- Does this indicate a problem or expected iteration feedback?

Quality vs Expectation Assessment

- Does the product meet defined requirements?
- Does it meet user expectations?
- How should the gap be interpreted?

Prioritization Decision

- Should feedback be treated as:
  - Enhancements
  - Required improvements
  - Deferred backlog
- Should any items be fast-tracked?

Schedule & Budget Consideration

- Should improvements be made immediately?
- Would rework affect future schedule or cost?
- Should current trajectory be preserved?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- User adoption risk
- Perception risk
- Rework cost risk
- Scope expansion risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Log feedback as backlog items
- Prioritize specific enhancements
- Conduct usability-focused iteration
- Maintain current roadmap
- Provide effort estimates for improvements

Learning Focus

Scenario 11 introduces:

- Managing post-release feedback
- Differentiating defects from enhancements
- Understanding user perception vs technical success
- Prioritization under constraint
- Avoiding reactive rework

Students must demonstrate:

- Strategic thinking
- Customer awareness
- Controlled prioritization
- Discipline in avoiding scope explosion

Key Insight

- A product can be:
  - Technically correct
  - Yet experientially incomplete
- The Project Manager must decide:
  - When to stabilize
  - When to enhance
  - When to hold the line

This page titled 4.5.9: Scenario 11 – Post-Release Feedback and Perceived Quality Gap is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.10: Scenario 12 – Stakeholder Pressure and Backlog Expansion Risk

Scenario Context

Following the release of RC1, user feedback identified several areas for improvement, including:

- Reporting flexibility
- UI consistency
- Performance responsiveness

In the previous scenario, these were categorized as enhancements rather than defects.

However, internal stakeholders have now reviewed the feedback and are advocating for immediate improvements.

The project is now entering a critical phase where backlog prioritization and scope discipline must be enforced.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: RC1 Feedback – Stakeholder Requests for Enhancement Acceleration

Hi,

Following the initial RC1 feedback sessions, we've received additional direction from your internal stakeholders regarding enhancement priorities.

Stakeholder Requests

We've been informed that there is strong interest in accelerating the following items:

- Dynamic filtering in reporting
- Customizable user views
- Improved UI consistency across modules
- Faster response time for filtered data

There is a view that these improvements are important for broader rollout readiness.

Impact Assessment

From our preliminary review:

- These items are not defects and were not included in original RC1 scope
- Fast-tracking them into the next iteration would require:
  - Reprioritization of current backlog
  - Additional development effort
  - Potential increase in QA cycles

Estimated impact:

- +8–10% additional effort for next iteration
- Possible schedule compression or extension depending on prioritization

Current Plan

Our current roadmap assumes:

- Stabilization of RC1
- Gradual incorporation of enhancements across subsequent iterations

Request

We need guidance on:

- Whether these enhancements should be fast-tracked
- Whether backlog should be reprioritized
- Whether additional scope should be formally introduced

We want to ensure alignment before making adjustments.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Enhancement Requests

Enhancement Requests

Feature	Origin	Priority (Stakeholder View)
Dynamic Reporting Filters	Executive Demo Feedback	High
Custom Views	User Feedback	High
UI Consistency Improvements	QA + User Feedback	Medium
Performance Optimization	User Feedback	High

Attachment B – Impact Estimate

Impact Estimate

Area	Impact
Development Effort	+8–10%
QA Effort	Increased regression cycles
Schedule	At risk depending on reprioritization

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

You are now facing:

- Strong internal pressure to improve the product quickly
- A growing enhancement backlog
- Vendor readiness to proceed with changes
- Risk of uncontrolled scope expansion

You must determine:

- Whether to fast-track enhancements
- Whether to protect the current roadmap
- How to prioritize improvements
- How to manage stakeholder expectations
- Whether formal change control is required

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is fast-tracking enhancements appropriate at this stage?
- Should the current roadmap be maintained?
- Is stakeholder pressure justified?

Scope & Backlog Management

- Should enhancements be added to immediate scope?
- Should backlog reprioritization occur?
- Should scope boundaries be reinforced?

Change Control Decision

- Do these enhancements require formal change control?
- Should cost and schedule impact be formally evaluated?
- Should approval be deferred pending impact analysis?

Schedule & Budget Assessment

- Can current schedule absorb additional work?
- What is the risk of scope expansion on cost trajectory?
- Should effort increase be accepted or constrained?

Stakeholder Management Strategy

- How will you respond to internal pressure?
- How will you balance expectations vs delivery discipline?
- How will you communicate prioritization decisions?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Scope creep risk
- Budget escalation risk
- Schedule disruption risk
- Product instability risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Maintain current roadmap and defer enhancements
- Prioritize a limited subset of enhancements
- Conduct formal impact analysis before inclusion
- Initiate structured backlog prioritization
- Introduce enhancements in phased delivery

Learning Focus

Scenario 12 introduces:

- Backlog inflation risk
- Managing stakeholder-driven scope expansion
- Prioritization under pressure
- Protecting delivery discipline
- Strategic decision-making under competing demands

Students must demonstrate:

- Control under pressure
- Structured prioritization
- Resistance to reactive decision-making
- Clear communication of trade-offs

Key Insight

Every enhancement request is reasonable.

But:

Not every reasonable request should be accepted immediately.

This scenario reinforces one of the most important project management principles:

> Uncontrolled backlog growth is the beginning of project instability.

This page titled 4.5.10: Scenario 12 – Stakeholder Pressure and Backlog Expansion Risk is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.11: Scenario 13 – Vendor Capacity Constraints and Resource Allocation Conflict

Scenario Context

Following RC1 feedback and stakeholder requests, the enhancement backlog for Project Reckon has expanded.

Several enhancements have been discussed for prioritization, including:

- Reporting flexibility
- UI consistency improvements
- Performance optimizations

ZynoxDev has reviewed the updated backlog and is now raising concerns regarding resource capacity.

The project is not over budget in a critical way, and schedule remains within tolerance, but **resource allocation is becoming a limiting factor**.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Resource Allocation Constraints – Backlog Prioritization Required

Hi,

Following the recent discussions around prioritizing post-RC1 enhancements, we have completed an internal review of our current capacity and delivery commitments.

I wanted to share an important update regarding resource allocation.

Current Capacity

Our current team allocation was planned based on the original project scope and stabilization activities following RC1.

Given the recent increase in enhancement requests, we are now approaching capacity limits in the following areas:

- Development bandwidth (particularly reporting and UI modules)
- QA coverage for expanded regression cycles

Key Constraint

At this stage, we are not able to:

- Maintain current stabilization efforts
- Deliver all requested enhancements
- Preserve existing schedule commitments

— simultaneously.

Trade-offs will be required.

Available Options

From our perspective, the following options are available:

Option A:
Maintain current scope and stabilization focus
→ No additional enhancements in next iteration

Option B:
Prioritize selected enhancements
→ Defer other backlog items

Option C:
Increase team capacity
→ Additional cost and onboarding time

Impact Considerations

- Increasing resources may introduce onboarding inefficiencies
- Reprioritizing scope may impact stakeholder expectations
- Maintaining current course may delay perceived product improvements

Request

We need your direction on how you would like to proceed.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Resource Allocation Snapshot

Resource Allocation Snapshot

Area	Capacity	Current Load	Status
Development	100%	95%	Near Limit
QA	100%	110%	Over Capacity
Architecture Support	100%	85%	Stable

Attachment B – Enhancement Backlog

Enhancement Backlog

Feature	Priority	Effort Estimate
Dynamic Reporting Filters	High	Medium
Custom Views	High	Medium
UI Consistency Improvements	Medium	Low
Performance Optimization	High	Medium

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

ZynoxDev has made it clear:

> Not everything can be done at once.

You must now make explicit decisions regarding:

- Scope prioritization
- Resource expansion
- Schedule implications
- Cost impact

You must determine how to balance:

- Stakeholder expectations
- Vendor capacity
- Delivery stability

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- How should the project proceed given capacity constraints?
- Which priority should dominate: stability, enhancements, or expansion?

Scope Prioritization Decision

- Which enhancements should be prioritized?
- Which should be deferred?
- Should scope be reduced or rebalanced?

Provide a clear prioritization strategy.

Resource Strategy

- Should additional resources be added?
- Are onboarding risks acceptable?
- Should capacity constraints be accepted instead?

Schedule & Budget Assessment

- Will prioritization affect schedule?
- Will adding resources affect budget trajectory?
- What trade-offs are acceptable?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Capacity risk
- Schedule disruption risk
- Budget escalation risk

- Product stability risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Stakeholder Management Strategy

- How will you communicate prioritization decisions internally?
- How will you manage expectations around delayed enhancements?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Prioritize specific enhancements and defer others
- Maintain stabilization and delay enhancements
- Increase resources under defined conditions
- Rebalance workload across iterations

Learning Focus

Scenario 13 introduces:

- Capacity constraints in outsourced development
- Explicit trade-off decision-making
- Prioritization discipline under pressure
- Resource vs cost vs schedule balancing
- Managing finite delivery capability

Students must demonstrate:

- Strategic prioritization
- Realistic resource thinking
- Controlled decision-making
- Ability to say “no” or “not now”

Key Insight

Every project eventually reaches a point where:

> Capacity defines reality.

Not:

- Requirements
- Ambition
- Stakeholder desire

This scenario teaches:

> Project management is the art of choosing what not to do — right now.

This page titled 4.5.11: Scenario 13 – Vendor Capacity Constraints and Resource Allocation Conflict is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.12: Scenario 14 – Resource Expansion and Quality Instability

Scenario Context

Following capacity constraints identified in the previous scenario, a decision was made to **increase ZynoxDev's development and QA resources** to accelerate delivery of prioritized enhancements.

New team members have been onboarded over the past iteration.

Initial expectations were:

- Increased development velocity
- Faster backlog throughput
- Improved responsiveness to enhancement requests

However, early indicators now show **unexpected side effects**.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Iteration Update – Resource Expansion Impact

Hi,

I wanted to provide an update following the recent addition of new development and QA resources.

Current Performance

- Velocity: 88% of baseline (slight decrease from previous iteration)
- Defects: 26 open (increase from prior iteration)
  - 3 high severity (new)
  - 10 medium
  - 13 low
- Burn rate: +9.5% cumulative
- Schedule: ~7 days behind original plan

Observations

We are seeing expected onboarding effects from new team members:

- Increased coordination overhead
- Additional review cycles required
- Some inconsistencies in code quality and standards
- Higher defect introduction rate in recently developed components

Integration and QA Impact

- New defects are primarily originating from recently added resources
- QA effort has increased to validate new contributions
- Regression cycles are taking longer than planned

Outlook

We expect performance to stabilize once onboarding is complete and team integration improves.

However, in the short term, this has impacted both velocity and defect levels.

Request

Please advise how you would like us to proceed:

- Continue with current expanded team and allow stabilization
- Reduce scope temporarily to improve quality
- Adjust schedule expectations
- Rebalance resource allocation

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Performance Comparison

Performance Comparison

Metric	Previous Iteration	Current Iteration
Velocity	92%	88%
Defects	18	26
High Severity	2	3
Burn Rate	+7.8%	+9.5%

Attachment B – Defect Origin Analysis

- 65% of new defects linked to recently onboarded developers
- Code review rework increasing
- QA regression cycles extended

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

A decision to increase resources has led to:

- Lower velocity
- Increased defects
- Higher cost
- Reduced short-term stability

You must determine:

- Whether to continue with expanded team
- Whether to reduce or restructure resources
- Whether to adjust expectations
- How to stabilize delivery without losing long-term benefits

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is the project still under control?
- Is current instability acceptable?
- Is resource expansion strategy still valid?

Performance Assessment

- Why has velocity decreased despite added resources?
- What is the significance of increased defect rates?
- Is this temporary or structural?

Resource Strategy Evaluation

- Should new resources be retained?
- Should onboarding approach be adjusted?
- Should team size be reduced or rebalanced?

Quality & Stability Position

- Should quality stabilization be prioritized over velocity?
- Should scope be reduced temporarily?
- Should additional QA controls be introduced?

Schedule & Budget Assessment

- Is further schedule slip acceptable?
- Is rising burn rate justified?
- Should corrective cost action be taken?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Quality degradation risk
- Onboarding risk
- Budget escalation risk
- Schedule instability risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Continue with expanded team and stabilize onboarding
- Reduce scope temporarily to improve quality
- Introduce stricter code review and QA controls
- Rebalance resource allocation
- Delay enhancement delivery to regain stability

Learning Focus

Scenario 14 introduces:

- Consequences of late resource expansion
- Onboarding and knowledge transfer challenges
- Short-term instability vs long-term gain
- Trade-offs between velocity and quality
- Managing unintended consequences of decisions

Students must demonstrate:

- Systems thinking
- Patience in stabilization
- Recognition of temporary vs structural issues
- Strategic adjustment of earlier decisions

Key Insight

Adding resources does not immediately increase output.

It often:

- Reduces efficiency temporarily
- Introduces quality variation
- Requires coordination overhead

Effective project management requires anticipating this effect.

This scenario reinforces:

> Every decision has second-order consequences

This page titled 4.5.12: Scenario 14 – Resource Expansion and Quality Instability is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.13: Scenario 15 – Architecture Audit and Design Integrity Risk

Scenario Context

Following the instability introduced by recent resource expansion and defect patterns, C-Bay's internal architecture team conducted a **targeted audit** of the Reckon system.

The audit focused on:

- Synchronization Engine design
- Data handling consistency
- Module interaction patterns
- Adherence to architectural guidelines

The audit results have now been shared.

While the system is operational, several **architectural inconsistencies** have been identified.

These do not currently block functionality.

However, they may affect long-term maintainability, scalability, and integration stability.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Architecture Review Feedback – Request for Alignment

Hi,

We received the feedback from your internal architecture review and wanted to align on next steps.

Summary of Findings

The review identified the following:

- Inconsistent handling of synchronization logic across modules
- Variations in data validation patterns
- Some divergence from originally documented architectural guidelines
- Redundant logic implemented in multiple components

From our perspective:

- These do not affect current functionality
- They do not block RC1 or immediate usage
- They are typical of iterative development where refinement occurs over time

Vendor Position

We believe the system remains:

- Functionally stable
- Deliverable within current timeline
- Suitable for iterative improvement in future cycles

Refactoring at this stage would:

- Require additional development effort
- Increase QA cycles
- Potentially impact near-term delivery commitments

Request

We need guidance on how you would like to proceed:

- Address architectural inconsistencies immediately
- Defer refactoring to future iterations
- Prioritize only high-risk areas

We want to ensure alignment with your expectations.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Architecture Audit Summary

Architecture Audit Summary

Area	Observation	Risk Level
Synchronization Logic	Inconsistent implementation across modules	High
Data Validation	Different validation rules applied in similar contexts	Medium
Code Duplication	Redundant logic across components	Medium
Architecture Compliance	Partial deviation from original design patterns	Medium

Attachment B – Impact Considerations

- Refactoring effort estimated at:
  - Development: +10–12%
  - QA: +8–10%
- Potential schedule impact: 1–2 weeks
- Risk if not addressed:
  - Increased maintenance complexity
  - Future defect risk
  - Scalability limitations

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

An internal architecture audit has revealed:

- Design inconsistencies
- Deviation from standards
- Potential long-term risks

However:

- The system is currently functional
- No immediate delivery blocker exists

- Refactoring will impact cost and schedule

You must determine:

- Whether to intervene immediately
- Whether to defer architectural cleanup
- How to balance short-term delivery vs long-term system integrity
- How to maintain vendor alignment while addressing internal concerns

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is the system acceptable for current release?
- Is architectural inconsistency a critical issue?
- Should action be taken now or later?

Architecture Assessment

- How serious are the identified inconsistencies?
- Do they represent technical debt or structural risk?
- Which issues are critical vs tolerable?

Refactoring Strategy

- Should refactoring be initiated immediately?
- Should it be phased across future iterations?
- Should only high-risk areas be addressed now?

Schedule & Budget Impact

- Is a 1–2 week delay acceptable?
- Is additional cost justified?
- Should delivery timeline be protected instead?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Long-term technical debt risk
- Maintainability risk
- Scalability risk
- Immediate delivery risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Internal Alignment Strategy

- How will you address internal architecture concerns?
- How will you communicate decisions to leadership?
- How will you maintain confidence in the project?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Proceed with RC1 and defer refactoring
- Address high-risk architectural issues immediately
- Develop phased refactoring plan
- Provide detailed architecture alignment roadmap
- Conduct focused redesign of synchronization module

Learning Focus

Scenario 15 introduces:

- Technical governance beyond surface metrics
- Balancing short-term delivery vs long-term system health
- Managing internal expert feedback
- Recognizing technical debt formation
- Making trade-offs under architectural uncertainty

Students must demonstrate:

- Technical awareness (without coding)
- Strategic decision-making
- Long-term thinking
- Balanced judgment

Key Insight

A system can be:

- Functionally correct
- Yet structurally fragile

The Project Manager must decide:

When to fix
When to defer
When to accept risk

This scenario represents a transition from:

“Is the project delivering?”

to:

“Is the system sustainable?”

This page titled 4.5.13: Scenario 15 – Architecture Audit and Design Integrity Risk is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.14: Scenario 16 – Executive Mandate for Immediate Architectural Correction

Scenario Context

Following the architecture audit findings, concerns about long-term system integrity were raised within C-Bay's technical leadership.

These concerns have now escalated to executive attention.

A senior executive has issued a directive emphasizing the importance of architectural consistency and long-term maintainability.

This directive introduces immediate pressure to address architectural issues — even as the project approaches stabilization and ongoing delivery milestones.

The project now faces a critical decision point:

- Continue forward with delivery and defer refactoring
- Or intervene immediately and risk disruption

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Architecture Alignment – Immediate Action Request

Hi,

We've received your internal feedback regarding the architecture review, along with the recent executive directive emphasizing the need for alignment with design standards.

We want to ensure we respond appropriately.

Current System Status

- RC1 delivered and under validation
- Stabilization activities ongoing
- No critical functional issues
- Architecture inconsistencies remain present

Executive Direction

We understand that there is now a strong preference to:

- Address architectural inconsistencies immediately
- Align all modules with original design standards
- Reduce long-term technical debt exposure

Impact of Immediate Refactoring

Based on our analysis, initiating immediate architectural correction would:

- Require redesign of key synchronization components
- Impact multiple dependent modules

- Introduce additional development and QA cycles

Estimated impact:

- Schedule delay: 2–3 weeks
- Additional effort: +12–15%
- Temporary instability during rework

Vendor Perspective

While we agree that alignment is important, we would recommend:

- Phased refactoring to minimize disruption
- Avoiding immediate large-scale changes during active delivery

However, we are prepared to proceed based on your direction.

Request

Please confirm whether you would like us to:

- Initiate immediate architectural refactoring
- Focus only on high-risk areas
- Defer refactoring to future iterations

We will align execution accordingly.

Best,
Julie

Internal Email from C-Bay Executive

Subject: Architectural Integrity – Immediate Action Required

Hi,

I've reviewed the architecture audit findings.

We cannot allow structural inconsistencies to become embedded in the system.

Short-term delivery cannot come at the expense of long-term maintainability.

I expect the team to:

- Address architectural inconsistencies proactively
- Ensure alignment with original design standards
- Avoid creating technical debt that will impact future scalability

Please provide a clear plan on how this will be handled.

Thanks,
[Executive Name]

Attachment A – Impact Summary

Impact Summary

Area	Impact
Schedule	+2–3 weeks delay
Budget	+12–15% effort increase
Quality	Temporary instability risk
Architecture	Improved long-term consistency

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

You now face direct executive pressure to:

- Correct architectural inconsistencies immediately

At the same time:

- The vendor warns of disruption risk
- The system is currently stable
- Delivery progress may be impacted

You must determine:

- Whether to comply fully with executive directive
- Whether to propose a phased or partial approach
- How to manage risk of disruption
- How to communicate your decision

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Should immediate architectural correction be initiated?
- Is executive directive justified in current context?
- Is current system state acceptable for continued delivery?

Architectural Risk Evaluation

- How critical are the inconsistencies?
- What is the risk of deferring correction?
- What is the risk of immediate refactoring?

Strategy Decision

Choose and justify:

- Immediate full refactoring
- Targeted correction of high-risk areas
- Phased refactoring across iterations
- Deferral with mitigation plan

Schedule & Budget Impact

- Is a 2–3 week delay acceptable?
- Is +12–15% cost increase justified?
- How should trade-offs be managed?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Disruption risk
- Technical debt risk
- Delivery risk
- Stakeholder alignment risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Stakeholder Alignment Strategy

- How will you respond to executive expectations?
- How will you manage vendor concerns?
- How will you maintain credibility on both sides?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Initiate targeted architectural correction
- Develop phased refactoring roadmap
- Address high-risk components immediately
- Defer full refactoring to controlled iteration
- Provide detailed execution plan for alignment

Learning Focus

Scenario 16 introduces:

- Executive intervention in technical decisions
- Managing top-down pressure
- Balancing authority vs practicality
- Evaluating disruption vs long-term benefit
- Leading under conflicting priorities

Students must demonstrate:

- Strategic judgment
- Confidence under pressure
- Ability to challenge or reshape directives constructively
- Systems thinking

Key Insight

Not all executive directives should be executed literally.

They must be:

- Interpreted
- Structured
- Operationalized

The Project Manager's role is not to say "yes" or "no."

It is to decide:

> How to achieve intent without creating unintended damage.

This page titled 4.5.14: Scenario 16 – Executive Mandate for Immediate Architectural Correction is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.15: Scenario 17 – Refactoring Impact and Regression Instability

Scenario Context

Following the decision to address architectural inconsistencies, ZynoxDev initiated refactoring activities focused on the synchronization and data validation components.

The intent was to:

- Align the system with original architectural standards
- Reduce long-term technical debt
- Improve consistency across modules

Refactoring has now been partially implemented.

However, early results show **unexpected instability in previously stable areas**.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Refactoring Update – Regression and Stability Impact

Hi,

I wanted to provide an update on the architectural refactoring effort and flag some important developments.

Refactoring Progress

We have completed initial refactoring of:

- Synchronization logic
- Data validation flows
- Selected module alignment changes

These updates are now integrated into the current build.

Regression Impact

Following integration of these changes, we are observing:

- 21 new defects identified in regression testing
  - 4 high severity
  - 9 medium
  - 8 low
- Several previously resolved defects have reappeared
- Increased inconsistency in system behavior across modules

Performance Impact

- Velocity: 85% of baseline
- QA cycles significantly extended
- Additional rework required across dependent components

Schedule & Budget Impact

- Estimated additional delay: +1–2 weeks beyond current projection
- Additional effort: +6–8%
- Burn rate trending upward again

Vendor Perspective

While these issues are expected in large-scale refactoring efforts, they are temporary and should stabilize once rework is complete.

We recommend continuing with the current approach to fully align architecture rather than reverting changes.

Request

Please advise how you would like us to proceed:

- Continue refactoring and stabilize system
- Pause refactoring and prioritize stability
- Limit refactoring scope further

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Defect Comparison

Defect Comparison

Metric	Before Refactoring	After Refactoring
Total Defects	10	31
High Severity	0	4
Reopened Defects	0	6

Attachment B – Performance Snapshot

Performance Snapshot

Metric	Status
Velocity	85% baseline
QA Effort	Significantly increased
Schedule	Additional delay emerging
Budget	Increasing beyond prior trend

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

A decision to improve architectural integrity has resulted in:

- Regression defects
- Reduced velocity
- Increased cost

- Additional schedule pressure

You must now decide:

- Whether to continue refactoring
- Whether to pause and stabilize
- Whether to adjust strategy
- How to manage risk introduced by your previous decision

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is the project still under control?
- Is current instability acceptable?
- Should refactoring continue or be adjusted?

Impact Assessment

- What is the significance of regression defects?
- How serious is the reintroduction of previously resolved issues?
- Is this expected or excessive?

Strategy Adjustment Decision

Choose and justify:

- Continue full refactoring
- Pause refactoring and stabilize system
- Reduce scope of refactoring
- Phase refactoring more gradually

Schedule & Budget Position

- Is additional delay acceptable?
- Is cost increase justified given long-term benefit?
- Should limits be enforced?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Regression risk
- System instability risk
- Delivery delay risk
- Budget escalation risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Lessons from Prior Decision

- What assumptions from the previous scenario proved incorrect?
- How should decision-making be adjusted moving forward?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Continue refactoring with increased QA controls
- Pause refactoring and restore system stability
- Focus only on critical architectural fixes
- Introduce staged rollback or containment strategy

Learning Focus

Scenario 17 introduces:

- Consequences of architectural intervention
- Regression risk management
- Managing unintended outcomes
- Adjusting strategy mid-execution
- Owning prior decisions

Students must demonstrate:

- Adaptability
- Accountability
- Systems thinking
- Decision refinement under pressure

Key Insight

Fixing the system can break the system.

Every improvement introduces risk.

The Project Manager must manage:

> Not just what to change — but how and when to change it.

This scenario reinforces:

> Second-order effects define real project complexity.

This page titled 4.5.15: Scenario 17 – Refactoring Impact and Regression Instability is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.16: Scenario 18 – Stakeholder Frustration and Loss of Confidence

Scenario Context

Following the architectural refactoring effort, Project Reckon has experienced:

- Regression defects
- Reduced velocity
- Increased QA cycles
- Additional schedule pressure

While these effects were expected to some degree, they have now become visible to internal stakeholders.

Several stakeholders who participated in RC1 validation sessions have raised concerns regarding:

- System stability
- Perceived regression in quality
- Delays in expected improvements

The issue is no longer limited to technical performance.

It is now affecting **confidence in the project's direction**.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Stakeholder Feedback – Stability Concerns

Hi,

I wanted to share an update following recent stakeholder feedback sessions.

Feedback Summary

Several stakeholders have raised concerns regarding:

- Increased instability in areas that were previously functioning
- Delays in expected improvements to reporting and usability
- Perception that the system is "moving backward" rather than improving

Current Status

- Velocity: 84% of baseline
- Defects: 28 open (3 high severity, regression-related)
- QA effort: significantly increased
- Schedule: further delay now projected

Observations

While we understand that refactoring introduces temporary disruption, stakeholder expectations appear to be focused on visible improvement rather than structural correction.

There is growing concern that:

- Too much change is being introduced at once
- Stability is not being maintained during improvement efforts

Vendor Perspective

We believe the current trajectory is still correct from a technical standpoint.

However, we recognize the need to better align with stakeholder expectations and restore confidence.

Request

Please advise how you would like to proceed in terms of:

- Stabilization vs continued refactoring
- Communication to stakeholders
- Managing expectations moving forward

Best,
Julie

Internal Stakeholder Feedback (Excerpt)

> "The system was working better two weeks ago than it is now. I understand improvements are being made, but from a user perspective, things feel less stable."
>
> "We expected progress after RC1, but instead we are seeing more issues."

Attachment A – Performance Snapshot

Performance Snapshot

Metric	Status
Velocity	84% baseline
Defects	Increasing (regression-driven)
QA Effort	High
Schedule	Further delay emerging

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

The project is now experiencing:

- Technical instability
- Stakeholder frustration
- Loss of confidence
- Increasing delivery pressure

You must determine:

- Whether to stabilize immediately
- Whether to continue improvement efforts

- How to restore stakeholder confidence
- How to manage communication without undermining the team

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is the project still under control?
- Is stakeholder concern justified?
- What is your immediate priority: stability or continued improvement?

Stability vs Progress Decision

- Should refactoring continue?
- Should the system be stabilized first?
- Should changes be slowed or phased differently?

Stakeholder Management Strategy

- How will you respond to stakeholder frustration?
- What message will you communicate?
- How will you rebuild confidence?

Vendor Alignment Strategy

- How will you align ZynoxDev with stakeholder expectations?
- How will you adjust execution approach without undermining vendor confidence?

Schedule & Delivery Position

- Is further delay acceptable?
- Should schedule expectations be reset?
- Should delivery milestones be redefined?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Stakeholder confidence risk
- System instability risk
- Delivery risk
- Reputation risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Pause refactoring and prioritize system stabilization

- Focus on resolving regression defects immediately
- Limit new changes until stability is restored
- Introduce phased improvement approach
- Develop stakeholder-facing stabilization plan

Learning Focus

Scenario 18 introduces:

- Managing perception vs reality
- Restoring confidence after regression
- Prioritizing stability under pressure
- Communicating effectively during setbacks
- Leading through uncertainty

Students must demonstrate:

- Emotional intelligence
- Communication discipline
- Strategic prioritization
- Leadership under pressure

Key Insight

A technically correct decision can still damage stakeholder confidence.

Success is not just:

- Building the right system

It is also:

- Maintaining belief in the system

This scenario reinforces:

> Trust is as critical as delivery.

This page titled 4.5.16: Scenario 18 – Stakeholder Frustration and Loss of Confidence is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.17: Scenario 1 – Reporting Module Ambiguity

Part I - Scenario Context

Current Phase

Project Reckon is in **Iteration 2** of development.

Architecture design has been delivered and approved at a high level. Development and QA are underway.

This is the first structured review cycle since construction began.

Velocity and burn rate appear mostly stable.

However, a potential scope and requirement issue has emerged.

Part II - Email from Julie Rama (ZynoxDev PM)

Subject: Iteration 2 Update – Reporting Manager Clarification Required

Hi,

We are nearing completion of Iteration 2 and preparing internal QA validation for the Reporting Manager module.

I wanted to flag a potential clarification issue before we proceed further.

In reviewing the URD, our architecture team interpreted the reporting requirement as providing **project-level summary reports**, including export capability at the project aggregation level.

However, during last week's demo, one of your internal stakeholders asked whether users would be able to export **user-level granular action item data**.

The URD does not explicitly specify export granularity.

At present:

- Iteration velocity is at 93% of baseline.
- Defect count: 11 open (1 high severity, 3 medium, 7 low).
- Burn rate: +2.8% over planned staffing curve.
- Schedule remains within tolerance.

If granular reporting is required, this will require additional development effort and may affect RC1 timeline.

Please advise whether this constitutes a scope modification or whether the original interpretation should stand.

Best,
Julie

Part III - Attachments Provided to Students

Attachment A – Velocity Snapshot

Velocity Snapshot

Metric	Baseline	Actual	Variance
Story Points Planned	45	42	-3
Completion Rate	100%	93%	-7%
Carryover Stories	0	2	—

Interpretation: Slight underperformance but within tolerance.

Attachment B – Defect Summary

Defect Summary

Severity	Count	Status
High	1	Open
Medium	3	In Progress
Low	7	Deferred

Trend: Stable compared to Iteration 1.

Attachment C – Budget Snapshot

Budget Snapshot

Category	Planned	Actual	Variance
Dev Hours	320	328	+2.5%
QA Hours	110	118	+7.2%
Total Burn	Within ±5% tolerance		

Part IV - Student Workbook Version

Students receive the following prompt:

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay overseeing outsourced development of Project Reckon.

ZynoxDev has requested clarification regarding the granularity of export functionality within the Reporting Manager module.

Your responsibilities:

1. Determine whether this is:
   - Requirement ambiguity
   - Vendor misinterpretation
   - Scope expansion
   - Minor clarification within scope
2. Evaluate:
   - Schedule impact
   - Budget impact
   - Change control necessity

    - Risk exposure
3. Provide a formal response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission

Submit a structured memorandum including:

Executive Position

- Is current performance acceptable?
- Is this a scope change?
- Is corrective action required?

Scope Determination

- Is granular reporting within approved scope?
- If unclear, how should ambiguity be resolved?
- Is formal change control required?

Schedule Assessment

- Is 93% velocity acceptable?
- Does adding granular reporting jeopardize RC1?

Budget Position

- Does +2.8% burn indicate structural drift?
- Should additional development for granularity be approved without cost review?

Risk Assessment

Classify risk under:

- Scope risk
- Schedule risk
- Financial risk
- Quality risk

Include likelihood and impact.

Formal Directive to ZynoxDev

State explicitly:

- Approve current interpretation
- Require granular export in RC1
- Defer granular export to later release
- Initiate formal change control
- Request impact analysis before decision

Your directive must be precise.

Part V - Teaching Objectives for Scenario 1

This scenario teaches:

- Early scope discipline
- Requirement ambiguity management
- Change control trigger evaluation
- Avoiding informal feature expansion
- Maintaining partnership tone while asserting control

It is not a crisis scenario.

It is a calibration scenario.

Part VI - Instructor Notes

Correct instincts to look for:

- Students should not casually approve expanded granularity.
- They should request formal impact analysis.
- They should clarify URD language.
- They should avoid reacting emotionally.
- They should maintain RC1 stability.
- They should protect baseline.

Common mistakes:

- Approving additional work informally.
- Ignoring scope issue.
- Overreacting to minor velocity variance.
- Failing to assess budget implication.

Part VII - Grading Weight for Scenario 1

Grading Weight

Section	Points
Executive Clarity	15
Scope Discipline	20
Budget Awareness	15
Risk Assessment	15
Directive Precision	20
Professional Tone	15
Total	100

Optional Instructor Escalation

If students:

Approve granular reporting without change control →
Next scenario includes burn spike and scope creep cascade.

Ignore ambiguity →
Next scenario includes rework dispute.

Overreact aggressively →
Next scenario includes vendor defensiveness.

This page titled 4.5.17: Scenario 1 – Reporting Module Ambiguity is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.18: Scenario 19 – Stabilize, Rollback, or Continue Forward

Scenario Context

Following recent refactoring efforts, Project Reckon has experienced:

- Increased regression defects
- Reduced system stability
- Stakeholder dissatisfaction
- Additional schedule delay

In response to Scenario 18, discussions around stabilization have begun.

ZynoxDev has now provided a structured set of options.

Each option carries trade-offs.

There is no risk-free path.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Stabilization Options – Direction Required

Hi,

Following recent feedback and ongoing system instability, we have evaluated possible paths forward and would like to align on next steps.

Current Status

- Velocity: 82% of baseline
- Defects: 30 open (4 high severity)
- Regression defects continue to appear
- QA cycles extended significantly
- Schedule delay increasing

Available Options

We have identified three possible approaches:

Option A – Continue Current Refactoring

- Proceed with architectural alignment efforts
- Continue resolving regression defects alongside refactoring

Pros:

- Completes architectural correction
- Avoids future rework

Cons:

- Continued instability in short term

- Further delay likely

Option B – Stabilize Current System

- Pause further refactoring
- Focus exclusively on resolving regression defects
- Restore system stability

Pros:

- Faster return to stable system
- Improves stakeholder confidence

Cons:

- Leaves architectural inconsistencies unresolved
- May require future rework

Option C – Partial Rollback

- Revert selected refactored components
- Restore previously stable system behavior

Pros:

- Immediate stability improvement
- Reduces defect load quickly

Cons:

- Loss of recent architectural improvements
- Potential rework required later

Vendor Recommendation

We recommend Option B (Stabilization) as the most balanced approach.

Request

Please confirm which option you would like us to proceed with.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Option Comparison

Option Comparison

Option	Stability	Long-Term Quality	Schedule Impact	Cost Impact
A – Continue Refactoring	Low	High	High Delay	High
B – Stabilize	Medium-High	Medium	Moderate Delay	Moderate
C – Rollback	High	Low-Medium	Low Delay	Medium

Attachment B – Current Defect Snapshot

- High Severity: 4
- Medium: 12
- Low: 14
- Regression defects increasing

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

You must now choose between:

- Continuing forward
- Stabilizing current system
- Rolling back recent changes

Each option has trade-offs across:

- Stability
- Cost
- Schedule
- Long-term quality

You must make a decision and justify it.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Decision

Select one:

- Option A – Continue Refactoring
- Option B – Stabilize System
- Option C – Partial Rollback

This must be explicit.

Decision Justification

Explain your reasoning across:

- System stability
- Stakeholder confidence
- Long-term architecture
- Delivery objectives

Trade-off Analysis

What are you giving up?

- What risks are you accepting?
- What risks are you avoiding?

Schedule & Budget Impact

- How does your decision affect timeline?
- How does it affect cost?
- Is this acceptable?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Stability risk
- Technical debt risk
- Delivery risk
- Stakeholder risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Recovery Strategy

- How will you stabilize or proceed?
- What immediate actions are required?
- What follow-up plan will you implement?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Execute stabilization plan immediately
- Pause further refactoring
- Implement rollback of specified modules
- Continue current path with tighter controls

Learning Focus

Scenario 19 introduces:

- Decision-making under uncertainty
- Managing trade-offs explicitly
- Choosing between imperfect options
- Understanding short-term vs long-term consequences
- Ownership of outcome

Students must demonstrate:

- Decisiveness
- Structured reasoning
- Risk awareness
- Accountability

Key Insight

There is no perfect option.

Only:

- Trade-offs
- Consequences
- Ownership

This scenario reinforces:

> Leadership is choosing the best imperfect path — not waiting for a perfect one.

This page titled 4.5.18: Scenario 19 – Stabilize, Rollback, or Continue Forward is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.19: Scenario 20 – Consequences of Stabilization Decision

Scenario Context

Following the decision made in the previous scenario, ZynoxDev has executed the agreed course of action.

Actions taken included:

- Adjustment of development priorities
- Focused effort on stability and defect resolution
- Reduction or restructuring of ongoing architectural changes

The system has now undergone one full iteration under the new approach.

Results are available.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Post-Stabilization Update – Current System State

Hi,

I wanted to provide an update following the implementation of the agreed stabilization approach.

Current Performance

- Velocity: 89% of baseline (improved from prior iteration)
- Defects: 12 open
  - High Severity: 1
  - Medium: 5
  - Low: 6
- Regression defects significantly reduced

Stability Improvements

- System behavior is more consistent across modules
- Previously unstable areas have been stabilized
- QA cycles have become more predictable

Residual Issues

While stability has improved, we are observing:

- Reduced development throughput
- Slower progress on enhancement backlog
- Some architectural inconsistencies remain unresolved
- Technical debt in certain modules is still present

Schedule & Budget

- Schedule: Recovery in progress but still behind original plan
- Budget: +9.3% cumulative

Stakeholder Feedback

Initial feedback indicates:

- Improved confidence in system stability
- Continued concern about delayed enhancements
- Mixed perception of overall progress

Next Consideration

We are now at a point where we need to determine:

- Whether to resume architectural improvements
- Whether to accelerate backlog enhancements
- Whether to continue focusing on stabilization

Please advise on how you would like to proceed.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Performance Comparison

Performance Comparison

Metric	Pre-Decision	Current
Velocity	82%	89%
Defects	30	12
High Severity	4	1
Stability	Low	Improved

Attachment B – Trade-off Summary

Trade-Off Summary

Area	Status
Stability	Improved
Enhancement Progress	Slower
Technical Debt	Still present
Budget	Increased

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

Your previous decision has resulted in:

- Improved system stability
- Reduced defect levels
- Slower progress on enhancements
- Continued budget pressure
- Remaining architectural issues

You must now determine:

- What the next priority should be
- How to balance stability, enhancements, and technical debt
- How to communicate progress and trade-offs

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Has the project improved?
- Is the current state acceptable?
- What is the primary objective moving forward?

Outcome Evaluation

- Was the previous decision effective?
- What improvements were achieved?
- What trade-offs emerged?

Strategic Direction

Choose and justify next focus:

- Resume architectural improvements
- Accelerate enhancement backlog
- Continue stabilization focus
- Introduce balanced phased approach

Schedule & Budget Position

- Is current trajectory acceptable?
- Should cost recovery measures be introduced?
- Should timeline expectations be adjusted?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Technical debt risk
- Delivery delay risk
- Budget overrun risk
- Stakeholder expectation risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Stakeholder Communication Strategy

- How will you communicate progress?
- How will you explain trade-offs?
- How will you manage expectations moving forward?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Resume architectural improvements in controlled phases
- Prioritize enhancement backlog
- Maintain stabilization focus
- Balance work across all areas

Learning Focus

Scenario 20 introduces:

- Evaluating outcomes of prior decisions
- Managing trade-offs across competing priorities
- Moving from reaction to strategy
- Recognizing that improvement in one area impacts another
- Leading forward after recovery

Students must demonstrate:

- Reflection
- Strategic thinking
- Balanced prioritization
- Forward planning

Key Insight

Every decision creates:

- Gains
- Losses
- New constraints

The next step is always:

> What do we optimize now?

This scenario reinforces:

> Good decisions do not eliminate trade-offs — they reshape them.

This page titled 4.5.19: Scenario 20 – Consequences of Stabilization Decision is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.20: Scenario 21 – Renewed Feature Pressure and Controlled Expansion

Scenario Context

Following stabilization efforts, Project Reckon has reached a more controlled state:

- System stability has improved
- Defect levels are manageable
- QA processes are more predictable
- Stakeholder confidence has partially recovered

With stability returning, attention has now shifted back to **product capability and feature expansion**.

Internal stakeholders are again requesting enhancements — but now with greater urgency due to upcoming external visibility and potential customer demonstrations.

The project is entering a new phase:

> Controlled growth after recovery.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Enhancement Prioritization – Next Phase Planning

Hi,

Following recent stabilization improvements, we're now in a position to begin addressing enhancement backlog items.

We've received renewed interest from your stakeholders regarding the following capabilities:

Requested Enhancements

- Advanced reporting filters and customization
- Improved dashboard visualization
- Faster response time for large data queries
- Additional user role configurations

These requests are being positioned as important for broader product visibility.

Current State

- System stability: Improved
- Defects: 9 open (all low severity)
- Velocity: 91% of baseline
- QA: Stable and predictable
- Budget: +9.1% cumulative

Capacity

With current team allocation, we can:

- Deliver a limited set of enhancements per iteration
- Maintain stability if scope is controlled

However, attempting to accelerate all requested features simultaneously may reintroduce instability and resource strain.

Request

We need guidance on:

- Which enhancements should be prioritized
- Whether scope should be expanded
- Whether additional resources should be considered

We want to ensure that we proceed in a controlled manner.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Enhancement Backlog (Updated)

Enhancement Backlog

Feature	Priority	Effort
Advanced Reporting Filters	High	Medium
Dashboard Visualization	High	Medium
Performance Optimization	High	Medium
Role Configuration Enhancements	Medium	Low

Attachment B – Current System Metrics

Current System Metrics

Category	Status
Stability	High
Defects	Low
Velocity	Slightly below baseline
Budget	Above tolerance but stable

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

The project has recovered from instability.

Now, stakeholder pressure has returned — but the system is not yet fully optimized.

You must determine:

- How to expand functionality without repeating past mistakes
- How to prioritize enhancements
- How to protect stability while enabling progress
- Whether to increase capacity or maintain discipline

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is the project ready for expansion?
- Should enhancements be accelerated?
- What is your overall strategy moving forward?

Scope Prioritization Strategy

- Which enhancements should be prioritized?
- Which should be deferred?
- How will you control scope growth?

Capacity Strategy

- Should current team size be maintained?
- Should additional resources be introduced?
- What lessons from prior expansion should guide this decision?

Stability Protection Plan

- How will you ensure stability is not compromised?
- What controls should be put in place?
- How will you monitor early warning signals?

Budget & Schedule Position

- Is additional cost acceptable at this stage?
- Should budget discipline be tightened?
- Should schedule flexibility be allowed?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Scope expansion risk
- Capacity strain risk
- Stability regression risk
- Budget escalation risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Prioritize a limited subset of enhancements
- Maintain current capacity and avoid expansion
- Introduce phased enhancement delivery

- Expand resources under controlled conditions
- Implement stricter change control thresholds

Learning Focus

Scenario 21 introduces:

- Controlled growth after recovery
- Applying lessons learned
- Preventing repeated mistakes
- Strategic prioritization
- Balancing progress with discipline

Students must demonstrate:

- Learning from prior scenarios
- Mature decision-making
- Proactive risk management
- Controlled expansion thinking

Key Insight

Stability creates opportunity.

But:

> Uncontrolled opportunity creates instability again.

This scenario reinforces:

> Discipline must continue even when things improve.

This page titled 4.5.20: Scenario 21 – Renewed Feature Pressure and Controlled Expansion is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.21: Scenario 22 – Overconfidence and Early Drift

Scenario Context

Following stabilization and controlled expansion, Project Reckon is now operating in a relatively stable and productive state:

- Enhancements are being delivered
- Defect levels are low
- Stakeholder feedback is positive
- Team coordination has improved

With progress visible and pressure reduced, execution has become more fluid.

However, recent observations suggest that **discipline may be relaxing slightly across several areas**.

No single issue is critical.

But patterns are beginning to emerge.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Iteration Update – Ongoing Progress

Hi,

I wanted to share a quick update on current progress.

Current Status

- Velocity: 94% of baseline
- Defects: 7 open (all low severity)
- Enhancements: progressing well
- Stakeholder feedback: positive

Observations

As we've moved into a more stable delivery rhythm, we've seen:

- Increased flexibility in handling small enhancement requests
- Some backlog items being adjusted informally during iterations
- Occasional direct communication between stakeholders and development team for minor clarifications

These have helped maintain momentum and responsiveness.

Delivery Outlook

From our perspective:

- The project is progressing smoothly
- Enhancements are being incorporated efficiently
- No major risks are currently visible

Request

Please let us know if you would like to maintain the current approach or introduce additional controls.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Current Metrics

Current Metrics

Category	Status
Velocity	94% baseline
Defects	Low
Enhancements	On track
Budget	+9.0% cumulative
Schedule	Stable

Attachment B – Observed Changes in Execution

- Minor enhancements introduced without formal documentation
- Backlog reprioritization happening within iterations
- Reduced formal reporting on low-priority items
- Faster turnaround on stakeholder requests

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

The project appears:

- Stable
- Productive
- Well-received

However, subtle changes in process discipline are emerging.

You must determine:

- Whether current flexibility is beneficial or risky
- Whether controls should be reinforced
- Whether early drift is beginning
- How to act before problems reappear

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is the project under control?
- Is current flexibility acceptable?
- Are there early signs of drift?

Process Discipline Assessment

Evaluate:

- Informal handling of enhancements
- Backlog changes within iterations
- Direct stakeholder-to-developer communication

Are these efficient or risky?

Control Strategy

- Should stricter controls be reintroduced?
- Should current flexibility be allowed?
- Should a hybrid approach be used?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Scope drift risk
- Governance erosion risk
- Budget creep risk
- Future instability risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Lessons Applied

- What lessons from earlier instability should apply here?
- How should prior mistakes influence current decisions?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Reinforce formal change control processes
- Maintain flexibility within defined boundaries
- Require documentation of all scope adjustments
- Restrict direct stakeholder-to-developer communication
- Introduce periodic governance checkpoints

Learning Focus

Scenario 22 introduces:

- Detecting early-stage drift
- Managing success without losing discipline
- Recognizing subtle risk signals

- Preventing recurrence of prior failures
- Balancing agility and control

Students must demonstrate:

- Awareness beyond metrics
- Pattern recognition
- Proactive management
- Discipline under low pressure

Key Insight

Projects rarely fail during crisis.

They fail when:

> Things seem to be going well.

This scenario reinforces:

> Discipline must be maintained even when pressure is low.

This page titled 4.5.21: Scenario 22 – Overconfidence and Early Drift is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.22: Scenario 23 – Visible Scope Drift and Baseline Erosion

Scenario Context

Following a period of stable delivery and increased flexibility, Project Reckon has continued to incorporate enhancement requests and minor adjustments.

In recent weeks:

- Small feature changes were introduced informally
- Backlog reprioritization occurred within iterations
- Direct communication between stakeholders and development teams increased

Individually, these changes appeared manageable.

Collectively, their impact is now becoming visible.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Scope Alignment – Emerging Variance

Hi,

I wanted to bring your attention to a trend we've identified over the past two iterations.

Current Observations

We are seeing a growing divergence between:

- Originally planned scope
- Currently delivered functionality

This appears to be driven by:

- Incremental enhancement requests
- In-iteration backlog adjustments
- Informal additions during development

Impact

The cumulative effect is now visible in:

- Increased development effort beyond planned estimates
- Additional QA cycles to support incremental changes
- Difficulty tracking baseline scope vs delivered features

Metrics

- Velocity: 92% of baseline
- Defects: 11 open (mostly low severity)
- Burn rate: +10.6% cumulative

- Schedule: Beginning to slip beyond prior stabilization range

Vendor Perspective

While individual changes were small, their accumulation is now affecting:

- Predictability
- Cost tracking
- Scope clarity

We recommend reviewing current scope alignment and determining how to proceed.

Request

Please advise on:

- Whether to formalize current scope changes
- Whether to reset baseline
- Whether to restrict further adjustments

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Scope Variance Summary

Scope Variance Summary

Category	Observation
Planned Features	Defined in URD + approved backlog
Delivered Features	Includes additional enhancements not formally approved
Scope Tracking	Partial mismatch between plan and delivery

Attachment B – Financial & Schedule Impact

Financial & Schedule Impact

Category	Status
Budget	+10.6% cumulative
Schedule	Beginning to exceed prior tolerance trends
QA Effort	Increased due to incremental additions

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

The project is now experiencing:

- Visible scope drift
- Baseline misalignment
- Budget and schedule impact from accumulated changes

You must determine:

- Whether scope drift has occurred
- Whether baseline should be reset
- Whether controls should be re-established
- How to regain project alignment

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Has scope drift occurred?
- Is the project still under control?
- Is intervention required?

Scope Assessment

- How significant is the divergence between planned and delivered scope?
- Should current enhancements be formalized?
- Should scope be rolled back or accepted?

Baseline Strategy

Choose and justify:

- Reinforce original baseline
- Reset baseline to reflect current scope
- Hybrid approach (partial reset + controls)

Budget & Schedule Position

- Is +10.6% burn acceptable?
- Is schedule drift becoming a concern?
- Should corrective measures be implemented?

Process Control Strategy

- Should informal adjustments be stopped?
- Should change control be enforced strictly?
- Should backlog management be restructured?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Scope creep risk
- Budget overrun risk
- Schedule instability risk
- Governance breakdown risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Freeze scope and enforce change control
- Formalize all additional features through change requests
- Reset baseline with full documentation
- Restrict in-iteration adjustments
- Provide detailed scope reconciliation report

Learning Focus

Scenario 23 introduces:

- Transition from subtle drift to visible impact
- Baseline integrity management
- Scope reconciliation
- Restoring control after flexibility
- Formalizing what was previously informal

Students must demonstrate:

- Recognition of cumulative impact
- Decisive corrective action
- Structured governance thinking
- Control re-establishment

Key Insight

Scope creep is not a single event.

It is:

> The accumulation of many “small, reasonable decisions.”

This scenario reinforces:

> Control lost gradually must be regained deliberately.

This page titled 4.5.22: Scenario 23 – Visible Scope Drift and Baseline Erosion is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.23: Scenario 24 – Scope Reconciliation and Stakeholder Conflict

Scenario Context

Following identification of scope drift in Scenario 23, a formal review of project scope has been initiated.

The review revealed:

- Several features implemented that were not formally approved
- Some features partially implemented based on informal discussions
- Differences between documented scope and delivered functionality

As part of restoring control, a **scope reconciliation effort** has been conducted.

However, this process has surfaced **conflicting stakeholder expectations**.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Scope Reconciliation – Alignment Required

Hi,

Following your direction, we conducted a reconciliation of current delivered functionality against the original project scope and approved backlog.

Reconciliation Findings

We identified three categories:

Category A – In Scope (Aligned)

- Core project features
- Approved backlog items

Category B – Informally Added Enhancements

- Reporting flexibility features
- Minor UI customization
- Additional filtering capabilities

Category C – Partially Implemented Requests

- Features discussed but not formally defined
- Some incomplete functionality

Stakeholder Feedback

We have received feedback from stakeholders indicating that:

- Enhancements currently in the system are now considered expected functionality
- Removal or deferral of these features would be viewed negatively
- Some partially implemented features are now assumed to be part of the product

Impact

If we attempt to:

- Roll back enhancements → Stakeholder dissatisfaction likely
- Formalize all enhancements → Budget and schedule impact
- Leave as-is → Scope and baseline remain unclear

Vendor Position

We can proceed with any direction, but we need clarity on:

- What constitutes final scope
- How to handle partially implemented features
- Whether additional effort will be approved

Request

Please advise how you would like to resolve:

- Scope alignment
- Stakeholder expectations
- Baseline definition moving forward

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Scope Categories

Scope Categories

Category	Description	Status
A	Approved Scope	Complete
B	Informal Enhancements	Delivered
C	Partial Features	Incomplete

Attachment B – Stakeholder Input

- “These reporting features are already in the system — they should remain.”
- “We expected these capabilities as part of the release.”
- “Removing features now would reduce confidence.”

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

You are now facing:

- Formal scope reconciliation
- Stakeholders resisting rollback
- Partially implemented features creating ambiguity
- Budget and schedule implications

You must determine:

- What the final scope should be
- How to resolve stakeholder conflict
- Whether to formalize, defer, or remove features
- How to restore control without damaging confidence

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is scope alignment achievable?
- How should conflict be resolved?
- What is your position on current scope state?

Scope Resolution Strategy

Choose and justify:

- Accept all enhancements and reset baseline
- Retain only selected enhancements
- Remove or defer certain features
- Formalize partial features through change control

Stakeholder Management Strategy

- How will you handle stakeholder resistance?
- How will you communicate scope decisions?
- How will you maintain confidence?

Budget & Schedule Impact

- What is the cost of formalizing enhancements?
- What is the impact of retaining all features?
- What trade-offs are required?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Scope ambiguity risk
- Stakeholder dissatisfaction risk
- Budget escalation risk
- Delivery instability risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Control Restoration Plan

- How will you re-establish scope control?
- What processes will be enforced going forward?
- How will you prevent future drift?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Formalize selected enhancements through change control
- Complete partially implemented features under approved scope
- Defer non-critical enhancements
- Reset baseline and update documentation
- Freeze further informal changes

Learning Focus

Scenario 24 introduces:

- Conflict between delivery reality and expectations
- Stakeholder resistance to scope correction
- Managing partially completed work
- Formalizing informal decisions
- Re-establishing control under pressure

Students must demonstrate:

- Conflict resolution
- Structured negotiation
- Scope clarity
- Leadership under tension

Key Insight

Once features exist, they become expectations.

Even if they were never approved.

This scenario reinforces:

> Controlling scope early is easier than correcting it later.

This page titled 4.5.23: Scenario 24 – Scope Reconciliation and Stakeholder Conflict is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.24: Scenario 25 – Baseline Reset and Contract Realignment

Scenario Context

Following scope reconciliation and stakeholder conflict in Scenario 24, it is now clear that:

- The original scope baseline is no longer accurate
- Informal enhancements have become embedded in the system
- Stakeholder expectations have evolved
- Budget and schedule assumptions have shifted

C-Bay has initiated a **formal realignment effort** to:

- Reset scope baseline
- Clarify deliverables
- Reconcile cost and schedule
- Establish clear control moving forward

ZynoxDev has responded with a formal proposal.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Project Realignment Proposal – Scope, Schedule, and Cost

Hi,

Following the recent scope reconciliation discussions, we have prepared a proposal to align the project moving forward.

Proposed Scope Baseline

We recommend redefining the project scope as follows:

- **Core Features (Original Scope)** → Completed
- **Enhancements (Previously Informal)** → Included as formal scope
- **Partial Features** → Completed or removed based on prioritization

This reflects the system as it currently exists and stakeholder expectations.

Schedule Realignment

To accommodate the expanded scope and stabilization efforts:

- Revised delivery timeline: +2 weeks beyond original plan
- Adjusted milestone checkpoints for future iterations

Budget Adjustment

Based on current effort and scope expansion:

- Proposed budget increase: +12–14%
- Reflects:

- Additional development effort
- Increased QA cycles
- Refactoring and stabilization work

Control Measures

To prevent further drift, we propose:

- Strict change control for all future enhancements
- Formal backlog prioritization reviews
- Defined iteration scope boundaries

Request

Please review and confirm:

- Acceptance of revised scope baseline
- Approval of schedule adjustment
- Approval of budget realignment

We believe this will establish a stable foundation moving forward.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Realignment Summary

Realignment Summary

Area	Original	Revised
Scope	URD-defined	Expanded (includes enhancements)
Schedule	Original timeline	+2 weeks
Budget	Baseline	+12–14%

Attachment B – Control Measures

- Formal change request process required for all new features
- Backlog review at start of each iteration
- No in-iteration scope adjustments allowed

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

You must now decide whether to:

- Accept the proposed realignment
- Modify the proposal
- Reject elements of the proposal

This decision will define:

- The new baseline for the project
- The credibility of project control moving forward
- The relationship with ZynoxDev

You must evaluate:

- Whether the proposed scope is acceptable
- Whether budget increase is justified
- Whether schedule adjustment is reasonable
- Whether control measures are sufficient

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Do you accept the realignment proposal?
- What elements do you approve or reject?
- Is the project now under control?

Scope Decision

- Should all enhancements be formalized into scope?
- Should any features be removed or deferred?
- Is the revised scope appropriate?

Budget & Schedule Decision

- Is +12–14% budget increase justified?
- Is a +2 week delay acceptable?
- Should adjustments be negotiated?

Contract & Control Alignment

- Are proposed control measures sufficient?
- Should additional controls be introduced?
- How will future drift be prevented?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Budget overrun risk
- Schedule extension risk
- Scope misalignment risk
- Governance failure risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Strategic Positioning

- How will you communicate this realignment internally?
- How will you justify the changes to leadership?
- How will you restore confidence in project control?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Approve full realignment
- Approve with modifications
- Reject certain scope elements
- Require revised proposal
- Implement additional governance controls

Learning Focus

Scenario 25 introduces:

- Formal baseline reset
- Contract realignment
- Converting informal history into structured agreement
- Negotiation of cost, scope, and schedule simultaneously
- Establishing control after drift

Students must demonstrate:

- Strategic negotiation
- Decision ownership
- Balance between acceptance and control
- Long-term thinking

Key Insight

A project can only be controlled once reality is acknowledged.

This scenario reinforces:

> You cannot manage what is no longer aligned with the plan.

You must:

- Update the plan
- Or restore the plan

This marks a major turning point in the practicum.

This page titled 4.5.24: Scenario 25 – Baseline Reset and Contract Realignment is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.25: Scenario 26 – Post-Realignment Execution Discipline Breakdown

Scenario Context

Following the formal realignment in Scenario 25:

- Scope baseline has been reset
- Budget and schedule adjustments have been approved
- Strict change control and backlog governance processes have been established

The project is now operating under a **new, clearly defined framework**.

Early execution under this framework has begun.

Initial progress appears stable.

However, small deviations from the new process are already emerging.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Iteration Update – Minor Adjustments and Progress

Hi,

I wanted to provide a quick update following the first iteration under the revised project baseline.

Current Status

- Velocity: 93% of revised baseline
- Defects: 8 open (all low severity)
- Budget: aligned with revised projections
- Schedule: on track under new timeline

Overall, the project is progressing well under the new framework.

Observations

To maintain delivery momentum, the team has:

- Incorporated a small reporting enhancement requested during iteration
- Adjusted backlog priorities mid-iteration to accommodate stakeholder feedback
- Allowed limited direct clarification between stakeholders and developers for efficiency

These changes were minor and intended to avoid delays.

Impact

- No immediate impact on schedule or budget
- Slight deviation from defined change control and backlog processes

Vendor Perspective

We believe these adjustments are practical and help maintain responsiveness without introducing significant risk.

Request

Please let us know if you would like us to continue operating with this level of flexibility or strictly enforce the newly defined controls.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Process Deviation Summary

Process Deviation Summary

Area	Deviation
Change Control	Minor enhancement added without formal request
Backlog Management	Mid-iteration reprioritization
Communication	Direct stakeholder-developer interaction

Attachment B – Performance Snapshot

Performance Snapshot

Category	Status
Velocity	Stable
Defects	Low
Budget	Controlled
Schedule	On track

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

After formal realignment, the project is showing:

- Stable performance
- Minor process deviations
- Informal flexibility returning

You must determine:

- Whether these deviations are acceptable
- Whether strict control should be enforced immediately
- Whether flexibility can coexist with discipline
- How to prevent drift from re-emerging

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Executive Position

- Is the project under control?
- Are process deviations acceptable?
- Is this early drift or acceptable flexibility?

Process Discipline Assessment

Evaluate:

- Minor enhancement without change control
- Mid-iteration backlog adjustments
- Direct stakeholder-developer communication

Are these efficient practices or risks?

Control Strategy

Choose and justify:

- Strict enforcement of all controls
- Allow limited flexibility within boundaries
- Define controlled exceptions

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Scope drift risk
- Governance erosion risk
- Future instability risk
- Process inconsistency risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Lessons from Previous Scenarios

- What caused drift earlier in the project?
- Are similar patterns reappearing?
- How should behavior be adjusted?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Reinforce strict adherence to change control
- Allow flexibility only with documentation
- Prohibit in-iteration scope adjustments
- Require all changes to be formally tracked
- Establish escalation for process violations

Learning Focus

Scenario 26 introduces:

- Post-realignment discipline testing
- Early detection of recurring patterns
- Managing small deviations before they grow
- Balancing agility with control
- Reinforcing process integrity

Students must demonstrate:

- Consistency
- Awareness of pattern recurrence
- Ability to enforce discipline
- Judgment in handling small deviations

Key Insight

Control is not established once.

It must be maintained continuously.

This scenario reinforces:

> The hardest part of project management is not fixing problems —
> it is preventing them from returning.

This page titled 4.5.25: Scenario 26 – Post-Realignment Execution Discipline Breakdown is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.26: Scenario 27 – Process Drift Reappears and Measurable Impact Emerges

Scenario Context

Following the first iteration under the realigned baseline:

- Minor process deviations were observed
- Flexibility was allowed in limited areas
- No immediate impact was visible

However, over the next iteration cycle, these deviations have begun to accumulate again.

The project is still functioning.

But early signs of **drift are now measurable**.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Iteration Update – Emerging Variance

Hi,

I wanted to provide an update on the most recent iteration and highlight a few trends we are observing.

Current Status

- Velocity: 89% of revised baseline
- Defects: 15 open (2 medium severity)
- Budget: +2.5% above revised projection
- Schedule: slight delay emerging (~2–3 days)

Observations

We are seeing a pattern similar to earlier phases:

- Incremental enhancements being added without full documentation
- Backlog adjustments occurring during iterations
- Increased coordination overhead due to informal changes

Impact

While no single issue is critical, the cumulative effect is now visible in:

- Reduced velocity
- Increased QA effort
- Slight schedule drift
- Additional effort not originally planned

Vendor Perspective

We believe this is still manageable, but it does suggest that maintaining strict process discipline may be necessary to prevent further impact.

Request

Please advise whether you would like to:

- Reinforce stricter controls
- Continue with current approach
- Adjust execution strategy

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Trend Comparison

Trend Comparison

Metric	Previous Iteration	Current Iteration
Velocity	93%	89%
Defects	8	15
Budget Variance	0%	+2.5%
Schedule	On track	Slight delay

Attachment B – Identified Causes

- Informal feature additions
- Mid-iteration scope adjustments
- Reduced adherence to change control

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

After allowing limited flexibility, the project is now showing:

- Declining performance
- Increased defects
- Budget and schedule drift
- Re-emergence of earlier patterns

You must determine:

- Whether control was insufficiently enforced
- Whether stricter measures are now required
- How to prevent further drift
- How to restore discipline without disrupting progress

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is the project under control?
- Is drift occurring again?
- Is intervention required immediately?

Drift Analysis

- What patterns are repeating from earlier scenarios?
- What caused the re-emergence of drift?
- Was prior control strategy insufficient?

Control Enforcement Strategy

- Should strict controls now be enforced?
- Should flexibility be removed entirely?
- Should escalation mechanisms be introduced?

Schedule & Budget Position

- Is current drift acceptable?
- Should corrective action be taken immediately?
- Should thresholds trigger intervention?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Scope drift risk
- Budget creep risk
- Schedule instability risk
- Governance failure risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Corrective Action Plan

- What immediate steps should be taken?
- How will discipline be restored?
- What controls will be enforced going forward?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Enforce strict change control with no exceptions
- Freeze all unapproved enhancements
- Require backlog lock at iteration start
- Eliminate direct stakeholder-developer communication
- Introduce formal compliance checkpoint

Learning Focus

Scenario 27 introduces:

- Recurrence of drift
- Consequences of partial enforcement
- Need for decisive intervention
- Restoring control after slippage
- Recognizing patterns over time

Students must demonstrate:

- Accountability for earlier decisions
- Strong corrective action
- Clear enforcement strategy
- Willingness to tighten control

Key Insight

Allowing small exceptions creates large consequences.

This scenario reinforces:

> Discipline ust be enforced — not suggested.

This page titled 4.5.26: Scenario 27 – Process Drift Reappears and Measurable Impact Emerges is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.27: Scenario 28 – Control Enforcement and Vendor Friction

Scenario Context

Following the reintroduction of strict controls in Scenario 27:

- Formal change control has been enforced
- Backlog is locked at iteration start
- Informal feature additions have been restricted
- Stakeholder-developer direct communication has been limited

These actions have successfully reduced scope drift.

However, they have also introduced new challenges.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Execution Update – Impact of Control Measures

Hi,

I wanted to provide an update following the implementation of stricter process controls.

Current Performance

- Velocity: 86% of revised baseline
- Defects: 9 open (stable)
- Budget: within revised projection
- Schedule: slightly extended due to reduced throughput

Observations

We are seeing the following effects:

- Improved control over scope and backlog
- Reduced unplanned work
- Slower turnaround for stakeholder requests
- Increased process overhead for approvals and documentation

Team Feedback

Our delivery team has noted:

- Reduced flexibility in handling small changes
- Increased administrative effort
- Slower decision cycles for minor adjustments

There is concern that:

- The current level of control may be impacting delivery efficiency
- Team responsiveness is reduced

Vendor Perspective

We fully understand the need for discipline.

However, we believe there may be an opportunity to:

- Introduce controlled flexibility
- Reduce friction for low-risk changes
- Improve execution speed while maintaining oversight

Request

Please advise whether you would like to:

- Maintain strict controls
- Introduce controlled flexibility
- Adjust process to improve efficiency

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Performance Comparison

Performance Comparison

Metric	Pre-Control	Post-Control
Velocity	89%	86%
Defects	15	9
Scope Drift	Present	Controlled
Process Overhead	Low	High

Attachment B – Team Feedback Summary

- “Too many approvals for small changes”
- “Slower iteration cycles”
- “Less ability to respond quickly to stakeholders”

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

Your decision to enforce strict control has:

- Reduced drift
- Improved stability
- Increased process overhead
- Slowed execution

You must now determine:

- Whether current controls are too restrictive
- Whether controlled flexibility should be introduced
- How to balance discipline with efficiency
- How to maintain vendor alignment

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is the current control level appropriate?
- Is reduced velocity acceptable?
- Is vendor concern justified?

Control vs Efficiency Assessment

- Has control improved project stability?
- Is process overhead too high?
- Is delivery efficiency being compromised?

Process Adjustment Strategy

Choose and justify:

- Maintain strict control
- Introduce controlled flexibility
- Define exception-based process
- Adjust approval thresholds

Schedule & Delivery Position

- Is reduced velocity acceptable?
- Should throughput be improved?
- What trade-offs are acceptable?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Over-control risk
- Delivery slowdown risk
- Vendor friction risk
- Re-emergence of drift risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Vendor Relationship Strategy

- How will you address vendor concerns?
- How will you maintain alignment and motivation?
- How will you communicate process expectations?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Maintain strict controls with minor adjustments
- Introduce defined low-risk exception process
- Allow limited flexibility for small changes
- Adjust approval process for efficiency
- Maintain discipline but streamline execution

Learning Focus

Scenario 28 introduces:

- Trade-offs between control and agility
- Managing process overhead
- Balancing discipline with execution speed
- Vendor relationship dynamics under constraint
- Refining governance models

Students must demonstrate:

- Balanced judgment
- Process design thinking
- Awareness of second-order effects
- Ability to fine-tune controls

Key Insight

Too little control creates chaos.

Too much control creates friction.

This scenario reinforces:

> Effective project management is not about extremes —
> it is about balance.

This page titled 4.5.27: Scenario 28 – Control Enforcement and Vendor Friction is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.28: Scenario 2 – Integration Instability and Defect Clustering

Scenario Context

Project Reckon has completed Iteration 3 and is approaching internal validation for Release Candidate 1 (RC1).

Development velocity has remained close to baseline. However, during recent integration testing between the Synchronization Engine and the iPET framework, a pattern of integration defects has emerged.

The issue is not yet classified as critical. However, defect clustering is concentrated in the synchronization layer, which is foundational to Reckon's integration into the broader platform.

This scenario tests architectural oversight, QA maturity evaluation, and early detection of structural risk.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Iteration 3 Status – Integration Defect Trend

Hi,

We have completed development activities for Iteration 3 and have moved into extended integration testing, particularly focusing on synchronization with the iPET framework.

While overall development velocity remains within tolerance, QA has identified a higher-than-expected concentration of defects within the Synchronization Engine module.

Current status:

- Iteration velocity: 95% of baseline
- Total open defects: 24
  - 3 High severity (all integration-related)
  - 8 Medium
  - 13 Low
- 2 previously closed integration defects reopened during regression testing
- Burn rate: +4.2% over projected staffing curve
- Schedule: RC1 timeline unchanged

The architecture team believes the defects are isolated to edge-case synchronization events under concurrent modification scenarios. They anticipate resolving these before RC1 freeze.

At this stage, we do not believe milestone adjustment is required.

Please advise if you would like a formal corrective action plan or if continued monitoring is sufficient.

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Velocity Snapshot

Velocity Snapshot

Metric	Baseline	Actual	Variance
Story Points Planned	48	46	-2
Completion Rate	100%	95%	-5%
Carryover Stories	0	1	—

Attachment B – Defect Trend Comparison

Defect Trend Comparison

Iteration	Total Defects	High	Medium	Low
Iteration 1	8	0	3	5
Iteration 2	11	1	3	7
Iteration 3	24	3	8	13

Note: 5 of Iteration 3 defects are integration-layer specific.

Attachment C – Burn Rate Overview

Burn Rate Overview

Category	Planned	Actual	Variance
Dev Hours	360	374	+3.9%
QA Hours	140	162	+15.7%
Total Burn	+4.2% overall		

QA staffing has increased effort during integration testing.

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay overseeing the outsourced development of Project Reckon.

The Synchronization Engine is critical for integration into the iPET ecosystem. Defect clustering has emerged in this component.

You must determine:

- Whether this represents normal integration stabilization
- Whether architectural misalignment may be emerging
- Whether QA rigor is adequate
- Whether burn rate indicates structural strain
- Whether RC1 milestone risk exists

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include the following sections:

Executive Position

- Overall health assessment
- Whether defect clustering is acceptable at this stage
- Whether corrective action is required

Quality & Architecture Assessment

- Interpretation of defect trend growth
- Significance of integration-layer concentration
- Reopened defect implications
- Assessment of QA maturity

Is this noise or early structural instability?

Schedule Position

- Is maintaining RC1 timeline realistic?
- Does defect clustering introduce hidden schedule risk?
- Should contingency planning begin?

Budget Assessment

- Does +4.2% burn indicate risk escalation?
- Is increased QA effort a positive signal or cost concern?
- Should financial review be initiated?

Risk Assessment

Classify and assess:

- Architecture risk
- Quality risk
- Schedule risk
- Budget risk

Assign likelihood and impact for each.

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Continue monitoring without escalation
- Submit formal root cause analysis
- Provide architectural design walkthrough
- Increase test automation coverage
- Reforecast milestone risk
- Freeze RC1 scope pending stabilization

Your directive must be specific and actionable.

Learning Focus

Scenario 2 introduces increased structural complexity:

- Defect growth trend analysis
- Integration-layer risk evaluation
- Reopened defect interpretation
- Budget and QA trade-offs
- Milestone realism assessment

Students must move beyond surface metrics and evaluate architectural stability.

This page titled 4.5.28: Scenario 2 – Integration Instability and Defect Clustering is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.29: Scenario 29 – Final Delivery Pressure and Completion Readiness

Scenario Context

Project Reckon has progressed through:

- Instability and recovery
- Scope drift and control
- Resource constraints and realignment
- Architecture review and refactoring
- Process tightening and optimization

The system is now:

- Stable
- Controlled
- Functionally complete with enhancements
- Operating within the revised baseline

Attention has now shifted to **final delivery and closure**.

Senior leadership is preparing for broader rollout and is requesting clarity on final readiness.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Final Delivery Alignment – Readiness for Completion

Hi,

As we approach the final phase of Project Reckon, I wanted to provide an update and align on completion readiness.

Current Status

- Velocity: 92% of revised baseline
- Defects: 6 open (all low severity)
- System stability: high
- Integration: stable
- Budget: +10.5% cumulative
- Schedule: aligned with revised timeline

Outstanding Items

Remaining work includes:

- Minor UI refinements
- Performance tuning in specific scenarios
- Completion of lower-priority enhancements

These items do not block functionality but contribute to overall polish.

Stakeholder Expectation

We understand that leadership is now focused on:

- Final delivery readiness
- Broad rollout planning
- Demonstrating project success

Vendor Perspective

From our perspective:

- The system is ready for final delivery
- Remaining work can be completed post-release

Delaying completion to address all minor items may:

- Extend schedule unnecessarily
- Increase cost without proportional benefit

Request

Please confirm:

- Whether to proceed with final delivery
- Whether additional refinement is required before completion
- Whether remaining work should be deferred

Best,
Julie

Attachment A – Final Status Snapshot

Final Status Snapshot

Category	Status
Features	Complete
Stability	High
Defects	Low
Enhancements	Mostly complete
Budget	Above original baseline
Schedule	Within revised baseline

Attachment B – Remaining Work

Remaining Work

Category	Priority
UI Refinement	Low
Performance Tuning	Medium
Enhancement Completion	Low-Medium

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

The project is now nearing completion.

You must determine:

- Whether the system is ready for final delivery
- Whether additional refinement is required
- Whether remaining work should be deferred
- How to define “complete”

You must balance:

- Quality
- Cost
- Schedule
- Stakeholder expectations

Prepare a formal written response to Julie Rama.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Position

- Is the project ready for completion?
- Should final delivery proceed?
- Is additional refinement required?

Completion Criteria Assessment

- Does the system meet project objectives?
- Are remaining defects acceptable?
- Is current quality sufficient for release?

Trade-off Analysis

- What is gained by releasing now?
- What is gained by delaying?
- What risks are accepted with each option?

Budget & Schedule Position

- Is additional cost justified for refinement?
- Should schedule be extended for polish?
- Is current trajectory acceptable?

Risk Assessment

Identify and evaluate:

- Release quality risk

- Stakeholder expectation risk
- Cost escalation risk
- Post-release support risk

Assign likelihood and impact.

Stakeholder Communication Strategy

- How will you define “ready”?
- How will you communicate remaining work?
- How will you position the outcome to leadership?

Directive to ZynoxDev

Provide a clear directive, such as:

- Proceed with final delivery
- Complete specific refinements before release
- Defer remaining work to post-release
- Prepare post-release enhancement plan

Learning Focus

Scenario 29 introduces:

- Defining completion
- Managing final delivery pressure
- Accepting imperfection
- Making release decisions under expectation
- Balancing polish vs progress

Students must demonstrate:

- Decisiveness
- Strategic trade-off evaluation
- Clear definition of “done”
- Ownership of final outcome

Key Insight

No project is ever truly complete.

It is:

> Declared complete.

This scenario reinforces:

> The Project Manager defins when enough is enough.

This page titled 4.5.29: Scenario 29 – Final Delivery Pressure and Completion Readiness is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.30: Scenario 30 – Post-Delivery Review and Lessons Learned

Scenario Context

Project Reckon has now been formally delivered and released.

The system is:

- Functionally complete
- Stable under expected usage
- Integrated into the iPET platform
- In active use by stakeholders

However, the project experienced:

- Scope drift and baseline misalignment
- Budget overrun beyond original tolerance
- Schedule adjustments
- Architectural refactoring and regression
- Stakeholder confidence fluctuations
- Process tightening and rebalancing

The project has succeeded.

But not without cost.

C-Bay leadership has now requested a **post-delivery review**.

Email from Julie Rama

Subject: Project Reckon – Post-Delivery Summary

Hi,

I wanted to take a moment to thank you for your collaboration throughout Project Reckon.

We have successfully delivered the system and completed rollout activities.

Final Project Status

- System stability: High
- Defects: Minimal and manageable
- User adoption: Positive
- Integration: Stable

Final Metrics

- Budget: +11.2% over original baseline
- Schedule: Delivered within revised timeline
- Scope: Expanded beyond original URD

Observations

From our perspective:

- The project ultimately achieved its objectives
- Early instability was resolved through structured intervention
- Process discipline improved significantly over time

Next Phase

We will transition into:

- Support and maintenance
- Incremental enhancements
- Continuous improvement

Request

C-Bay leadership has requested a formal summary of:

- What went well
- What could have been improved
- Key lessons for future projects

We would appreciate your perspective.

Best,
Julie

Internal Email from C-Bay Leadership

Subject: Project Reckon – Lessons Learned

Hi,

Now that Project Reckon has been delivered, I would like a clear assessment of:

- Where we lost control and why
- What decisions had the greatest impact
- What we would do differently next time
- How we can improve future outsourced initiatives

This is important for our long-term strategy.

Please provide a structured review.

Thanks,
[Executive Name]

Attachment A – Final Summary

Final Summary

Category	Outcome
Scope	Expanded

Category	Outcome
Budget	+11.2%
Schedule	Adjusted
Stability	High
User Feedback	Positive

Student Assignment

You are the Project Manager at C-Bay.

Project Reckon has been successfully delivered.

However, leadership now requires a **clear and honest evaluation** of the project.

You must:

- Reflect on decisions made throughout the project
- Identify where control was lost and regained
- Evaluate trade-offs
- Extract lessons for future projects

Prepare a formal post-delivery review.

Required Submission Structure

Your memorandum must include:

Executive Summary

- Was the project successful?
- What were the key outcomes?
- Was success achieved efficiently?

What Went Well

- What decisions contributed positively?
- What processes worked effectively?
- What enabled recovery and success?

What Could Have Been Improved

- Where was control lost?
- What decisions led to instability?
- What early signals were missed?

Critical Decision Analysis

Identify 2–3 key decisions and evaluate:

- What was the context?
- What was the decision?
- What were the consequences?

Lessons Learned

- What principles should guide future projects?
- What should be done differently next time?
- What controls should be implemented earlier?

Recommendations for Future Projects

Provide specific recommendations on:

- Scope management
- Vendor governance
- Change control
- Risk management
- Communication

Final Reflection

- What did you learn as a Project Manager?
- How has your approach to managing outsourced projects evolved?

Learning Focus

Scenario 30 introduces:

- Reflective leadership
- Accountability for outcomes
- Learning from complexity
- Translating experience into future practice
- Strategic thinking beyond delivery

Students must demonstrate:

- Honesty
- Insight
- Structured reflection
- Ability to connect actions to outcomes

Key Insight

Success is not just:

- Delivering the project

It is:

- Understanding how it was delivered

This scenario reinforces:

> The value of a project is not only in its outcome —
> but in what it teaches the organization.

Final Practicum Insight

Across all 30 scenarios, students should now understand:

- Projects drift gradually, not suddenly
- Control must be maintained continuously
- Every decision has second-order effects
- Trade-offs are unavoidable
- Leadership requires judgment, not just process

This page titled 4.5.30: Scenario 30 – Post-Delivery Review and Lessons Learned is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

4.5.31: Project Reckon Risk Register and Control Log

Purpose of the Risk Log

Project Reckon is a fully outsourced product development initiative. Risks do not appear suddenly — they accumulate gradually.

Students must maintain a **living Risk Register** across all scenarios.

Each week:

- New risks may be added.
- Existing risks must be updated.
- Risk severity may increase or decrease.
- Mitigation actions must be documented.
- Residual exposure must be evaluated.

This artifact becomes cumulative and is submitted at the end of the practicum.

Risk Log Structure

Students must maintain the following table:

Project Reckon Risk Register

Project Reckon Risk Register Requirements

Risk ID	Risk Description	Category	Trigger/ Event	Likelihood (1–5)	Impact (1–5)	Risk Score	Mitigation Action	Owner	Status	Residual Risk

Field Definitions

Risk ID

Unique identifier (R-01, R-02, etc.)

Risk Description

Concise but specific statement.

Example:
“Synchronization Engine defect clustering may indicate architectural instability in concurrent update handling.”

Category

Choose one:

- Scope
- Schedule
- Budget
- Quality
- Architecture
- Vendor Management

- Integration
- Political/Executive
- Dependency
- Change Control

Trigger/Event

What caused the risk to be logged?

Example:
“Iteration 3 defect spike in integration module.”

Likelihood (1–5)

1 = Rare
2 = Unlikely
3 = Possible
4 = Likely
5 = Almost Certain

Impact (1–5)

1 = Minimal
2 = Low
3 = Moderate
4 = High
5 = Severe

Risk Score

Risk Score = Likelihood × Impact

Interpretation:

- 1–5 = Low
- 6–10 = Moderate
- 11–15 = Elevated
- 16–25 = Critical

Mitigation Action

Specific and actionable.

Example:

- Require architectural walkthrough.
- Increase QA concurrency testing.
- Initiate formal change control.
- Freeze new feature additions.

Owner

Who is accountable?

- C-Bay PM

- ZynoxDev Architecture Lead
- QA Manager
- Steering Committee

Status

- Open
- Monitoring
- Mitigating
- Escalated
- Closed

Residual Risk

After mitigation, what level remains?

Low / Moderate / High / Critical

Weekly Risk Log Requirements

At the end of each scenario submission, students must:

1. Add any new risks.
2. Update likelihood/impact of existing risks.
3. Adjust mitigation status.
4. Identify any risks requiring escalation.
5. Explain if risk posture is improving or deteriorating.

Example Entry (Scenario 2)

Example Entry

Risk ID	Risk Description	Category	Trigger/ Event	Likelihood	Impact	Score	Mitigation	Owner	Status	Residual
R-02	Integration defect clustering may reflect architectural instability	Architecture	Iteration 3 defect spike	3	4	12	Require root cause analysis and concurrency testing expansion	ZynoxDev Arch Lead	Mitigating	Moderate

Risk Log Grading Component

Students are graded on:

Risk Log Grading Component

Criteria	Points
Risk Identification Accuracy	20
Appropriate Likelihood & Impact Calibration	20
Mitigation Precision	20
Escalation Discipline	20

Criteria	Points
Longitudinal Risk Tracking Across Weeks	20

Total: 100 points (cumulative)

Cumulative End-of-Module Requirement

Final Submission must include:

1. Complete Risk Register
2. Risk Trend Analysis (2–3 pages)
    - Which risks increased?
    - Which were contained?
    - Which were underestimated?
3. Risk Posture at Release Decision
4. Lessons Learned in Risk Detection

Teaching Impact

This artifact forces students to:

- Think longitudinally
- Recognize pattern formation
- Avoid “week-by-week amnesia”
- Practice early detection
- Understand mitigation vs resolution
- Avoid reactive management

It converts smulation into enterprise realism.

This page titled 4.5.31: Project Reckon Risk Register and Control Log is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

INDEX

S

StrategicPlanning
2.3.4.1: SWOT Analysis for Outsourcing Justification

V

VendorManagement
2.2: The Procurement and Solicitation Process

This page titled Index is shared under a Public Domain license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

GLOSSARY

S

Sample Word 1 | Sample Definition 1

This page titled Glossary is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

DETAILED LICENSING

Overview

Title: Managing Outsourcing - A Practicum

Webpages: 107

All licenses found:

- CC BY 4.0: 93.5% (100 pages)
- Public Domain: 5.6% (6 pages)
- Undeclared: 0.9% (1 page)

By Page

- Managing Outsourcing - A Practicum - *CC BY 4.0*
  - Front Matter - *CC BY 4.0*
    - TitlePage - *CC BY 4.0*
    - InfoPage - *Public Domain*
    - Program Page - *Public Domain*
    - Table of Contents - *Public Domain*
    - Accessibility Statement - *Public Domain*
    - AI Use - *Undeclared*
    - About the Book - *CC BY 4.0*
    - About the Author - *CC BY 4.0*
    - Licensing - *CC BY 4.0*
  - 1: Foundations for Success- How to Navigate This Book - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 1.1: Preface - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 1.2: How to use this book? - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 1.3: Overview - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 1.4: Problem-Based Learning- A Pedagogical Approach That Lasts - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 1.5: Your role in this Practicum - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 1.6: Tools and Resources - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 1.7: Grading and Assessment Overview - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 1.8: Collaboration and Integrity - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 1.9: Problem-Based Learning Student Guide - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 1.10: Welcome to C-Bay Inc. - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 1.11: Forming Teams for the Practicum - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 1.12: Project Management Basics - *CC BY 4.0*
  - 2: Introduction to Outsourcing - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 2.1: Outsourcing – What It Means Today - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.1.1: Case Study- Walmart - The 100,000 T-Shirts - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.1.2: Case Study- Boeing and the Outsourcing Dilemma - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 2.2: The Procurement and Solicitation Process - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.2.1: Procurement and Solicitation – The Work Before the Work - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.2.2: Step 1 - Procurement Strategy – Laying the Groundwork - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.2.3: Step 2- Establish Requirements – Getting the Documentation Right - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.2.4: Step 3- Statement of Work (SOW) – Defining the Relationship - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.2.5: Step 4- Request for Proposal (RFP) – Finding the Right Fit - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.2.6: Step 5- Vendor Response Evaluation – More Than Numbers - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.2.7: Step 6- Contract Negotiation and Signing – Setting Legal Ground Rules - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.2.8: Step 7- Monitoring and Control – Staying in the Loop - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.2.9: Deliverables from the Procurement Process - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.2.10: Final Thoughts- The Project Manager's Role in Procurement - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.2.11: Step 8- Contract Management and Closure – Delivering and Wrapping Up - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 2.3: Case Study - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.3.1: Planning for Outsourcing - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.3.2: Initiation- Exploring Outsourcing Options for the Reckon Project - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.3.3: Plan of Attack- Making the Case for Smart Outsourcing - *CC BY 4.0*
      - 2.3.4: Planning for Outsourcing – Student Workbook - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 2.3.4.1: SWOT Analysis for Outsourcing Justification - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 2.3.4.2: Make-or-Buy Analysis - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 2.3.4.3: Contract Type Evaluation - *CC BY 4.0*

        - 2.3.4.4: Supplier Selection Plan - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 2.3.4.5: Risk Management Plan - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 2.3.4.6: Reflection Questions and Lessons Learned - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 2.3.4.7: Submission Checklist and Final Assembly - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 2.3.4.8: Reflection and Final Submission - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 3: Building the Procurement and Solicitation Plan - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 3.1: Outsourcing Brief - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 3.2: Plan of Attack (with Templates) - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 3.3: Learning Resources - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 3.4: Tips and Traps - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 3.5: FAQs - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 3.6: Grading Rubric – Chapter 3- Procurement and Solicitation Plan - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 3.7: Reflection and Analysis Questions - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 3.8: Submission Checklist - *CC BY 4.0*
    - 4: Managing the Supplier — Execution Under Fire - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 4.1: From Procurement to Execution - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 4.2: Project Execution in the Context of Managing a Vendor - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 4.3: Project Reckon - Enterprise Context - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 4.4: Managing a Fully Outsourced Product Development Initiative - *CC BY 4.0*
        - 4.5: Project Reckon — Applied Vendor Management Lab - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.1: Scenario 3 – Financial Strain and Emerging Scope Pressure - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.2: Scenario 4 – Change Order Request and Emerging Milestone Slip - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.3: Scenario 5 – Executive Pressure and Vendor Defensiveness - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.4: Scenario 6 – Formal Corrective Action and Performance Accountability - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.5: Scenario 7 – Vendor Pushback and Contract Alignment - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.6: Scenario 8 – Internal Escalation and Executive Scrutiny - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.7: Scenario 9 – Budget Threshold Breach and CFO Escalation - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.8: Scenario 10 – Release Candidate Go / No-Go Decision - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.9: Scenario 11 – Post-Release Feedback and Perceived Quality Gap - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.10: Scenario 12 – Stakeholder Pressure and Backlog Expansion Risk - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.11: Scenario 13 – Vendor Capacity Constraints and Resource Allocation Conflict - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.12: Scenario 14 – Resource Expansion and Quality Instability - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.13: Scenario 15 – Architecture Audit and Design Integrity Risk - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.14: Scenario 16 – Executive Mandate for Immediate Architectural Correction - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.15: Scenario 17 – Refactoring Impact and Regression Instability - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.16: Scenario 18 – Stakeholder Frustration and Loss of Confidence - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.17: Scenario 1 – Reporting Module Ambiguity - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.18: Scenario 19 – Stabilize, Rollback, or Continue Forward - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.19: Scenario 20 – Consequences of Stabilization Decision - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.20: Scenario 21 – Renewed Feature Pressure and Controlled Expansion - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.21: Scenario 22 – Overconfidence and Early Drift - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.22: Scenario 23 – Visible Scope Drift and Baseline Erosion - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.23: Scenario 24 – Scope Reconciliation and Stakeholder Conflict - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.24: Scenario 25 – Baseline Reset and Contract Realignment - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.25: Scenario 26 – Post-Realignment Execution Discipline Breakdown - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.26: Scenario 27 – Process Drift Reappears and Measurable Impact Emerges - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.27: Scenario 28 – Control Enforcement and Vendor Friction - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.28: Scenario 2 – Integration Instability and Defect Clustering - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.29: Scenario 29 – Final Delivery Pressure and Completion Readiness - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.30: Scenario 30 – Post-Delivery Review and Lessons Learned - *CC BY 4.0*
            - 4.5.31: Project Reckon Risk Register and Control Log - *CC BY 4.0*
    - Back Matter - *CC BY 4.0*
        - Index - *Public Domain*
        - Glossary - *CC BY 4.0*
        - Detailed Licensing - *Public Domain*
        - Instructor Facilitation Guide - *CC BY 4.0*
        - Bonus Material - *CC BY 4.0*
        - Templates and Tools Library - *CC BY 4.0*
        - Decision Frameworks - *CC BY 4.0*

This page titled Managing Outsourcing - A Practicum is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit Singh.

Instructor Facilitation Guide

Project Reckon Practicum

Managing a Fully Outsourced Product Development Initiative

Purpose and Philosophy

This practicum is designed to move students from:

> Understanding project management → **Practicing project leadership under uncertainty**

Unlike traditional instruction, this module:

- Does not present clean problems
- Does not provide complete information
- Does not reward memorization

Instead, it simulates:

- Ambiguity
- Trade-offs
- Stakeholder pressure
- Imperfect decision environments

Instructor Objective

Your goal is not to:

- Teach the “correct” answer

Your goal is to:

- Develop **judgment**
- Reinforce **discipline**
- Encourage **decision ownership**

Instructor Role (Expanded)

You operate in **three simultaneous roles**:

Facilitator

- Guide thinking, not answers
- Ask probing questions
- Challenge assumptions

System Designer

- Adjust scenario intensity
- Introduce consequences
- Control pacing

Executive Voice

At times, you will act as:

- CFO
- CTO
- Executive Sponsor
- Stakeholder

This introduces realism and pressure.

Classroom Setup Models

Model A – Individual Execution

- Students respond individually
- Best for writing discipline

Model B – Team-Based Simulation

- Groups act as PM office
- Best for discussion and debate

Model C – Hybrid (Recommended)

- Discussion → Individual submission

Weekly Facilitation Flow (Detailed)

Phase 1 – Scenario Launch (5–10 min)

Instructor:

- Provides scenario
- Reads key email (optionally aloud)
- Highlights **signals, not conclusions**

Do NOT interpret the scenario.

Phase 2 – Silent Analysis (10–15 min)

Students:

- Read scenario independently
- Identify:
  - Issue
  - Risk
  - Decision

Phase 3 – Structured Discussion (20–30 min)

Instructor leads using:

Core Question Framework

1. Signal Identification
    - “What is actually happening here?”
2. Pattern Recognition
    - “Is this new, or part of a trend?”
3. Decision Pressure
    - “What decision must be made now?”
4. Trade-offs
    - “What are you giving up?”
5. Risk
    - “What could go wrong next?”

Phase 4 – Decision Commitment (Critical)

Students must:

- Take a position
- Defend it

Instructor must enforce:

> No vague answers
> No “it depends” without conclusion

Phase 5 – Debrief (10–15 min)

Instructor:

- Highlights strong reasoning
- Compares approaches
- Emphasizes trade-offs

Deep Facilitation Techniques

Technique 1 – “Push for the Second Layer”

Student:
“We should monitor.”

Instructor:
“What happens if this continues for 3 weeks?”

Technique 2 – “Force Trade-offs”

Student:
“We should improve quality.”

Instructor:
“What are you willing to delay or spend?”

Technique 3 – “Reverse the Decision”

Ask:

“What would happen if you did the opposite?”

Technique 4 – “Future Projection”

“Where will this project be in 2 scenarios?”

Technique 5 – “Decision Ownership”

“Are you comfortable explaining this decision to the CFO?”

Scenario Phase Guidance (Deep)

Phase 1: Early Execution (Scenarios 1–5)

Focus:

- Scope discipline
- Early signals

Instructor Behavior:

- Push students to act early
- Challenge “it’s small” thinking

Phase 2: Pattern Formation (6–15)

Focus:

- Trends
- Corrective action

Instructor Behavior:

- Force pattern recognition
- Ask:
  “What’s repeating?”

Phase 3: Escalation & Conflict (16–24)

Focus:

- Leadership under pressure
- Trade-offs

Instructor Behavior:

- Introduce tension
- Simulate executive pressure

Phase 4: Control & Closure (25–30)

Focus:

- Alignment
- Reflection

Instructor Behavior:

- Push strategic thinking
- Challenge hindsight bias

Common Student Failure Modes (Detailed)

Passive Monitoring

Symptoms:

- “Let’s wait”
- No action taken

Instructor Response:
“What signal would make you act?”

Overreaction

Symptoms:

- Immediate escalation
- Over-control

Instructor Response:
“What problem are you actually solving?”

Narrow Thinking

Symptoms:

- Focus only on defects OR cost

Instructor Response:
“What else is affected?”

Avoiding Decisions

Symptoms:

- Long analysis
- No conclusion

Instructor Response:
“Choose.”

Emotional Reaction

Symptoms:

- Blaming vendor
- Defensive tone

Instructor Response:
“What would an executive say?”

Adaptive Scenario Control (Advanced)

If Students Are Too Passive

Inject:

- Escalating defects
- Budget spike
- Stakeholder complaint

If Students Are Too Aggressive

Inject:

- Vendor pushback
- Relationship strain

If Students Ignore Finance

Inject:

- CFO escalation

If Students Allow Scope Drift

Inject:

- Scope reconciliation crisis

If Students Over-Control

Inject:

- Slow delivery
- Team frustration

Evaluation Model (Expanded)

Grade Based On:

- Decision Quality
  - Clear, actionable
- Trade-off Awareness
  - Recognizes consequences
- Risk Insight
  - Identifies future problems
- Structure
  - Organized thinking
- Tone
  - Professional, executive

Do NOT Grade Based On:

- Agreement with instructor

- Technical detail
- Length of response

Capstone Facilitation (Scenario 30)

Instructor Questions:

- “When did control break down?”
- “What decision mattered most?”
- “What would you change first?”

Encourage:

- Honest reflection
- Ownership
- Pattern awareness

Teaching Philosophy (Core)

Students must learn:

- Projects drift gradually
- Control must be continuous
- Decisions have second-order effects
- Trade-offs are unavoidable

Final Instructor Insight

The most important question in this practicum is:

> “What happens next if I do nothing?”

Optional Advanced Delivery Modes

Live Simulation Mode

- Instructor reads Julie’s email aloud
- Students respond in real-time

Executive Review Mode

- Students present dashboard
- Instructor plays CFO

Debate Mode

- Split class into opposing decisions
- Force defense

Final Instructor Reminder

Do not rescue students too early.

Let them:

- Make imperfect decisions
- Experience consequences
- Learn through pattern recognition

Final Thought

This practicum is not about:

> Getting it right

It is about:

> Learning how to decide when things are not clear

This page titled Instructor Facilitation Guide is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

Bonus Material

Common Project Failure Patterns

Lessons from Project Reckon

Purpose of This Section

Project failures rarely result from a single catastrophic event.

They emerge from **repeating patterns of behavior, decisions, and overlooked signals**.

Throughout Project Reckon, the same underlying patterns appeared in different forms across multiple scenarios.

Understanding these patterns allows project managers to:

- Detect problems early
- Intervene effectively
- Prevent recurrence

This section summarizes the most critical patterns observed.

Pattern 1: Ambiguity Becomes Conflict

Description

Unclear requirements or loosely defined scope lead to different interpretations between client and vendor.

How It Appears

- Different expectations for the same feature
- Vendor builds what was “understood”
- Stakeholders expect something else

Consequence

- Rework
- Change order disputes
- Schedule delays

Key Lesson

> Ambiguity is not harmless—it is deferred conflict.

Prevention

- Clarify requirements early
- Validate interpretation before development
- Use formal change control

Pattern 2: Small Flexibility Becomes Scope Drift

Description

Minor, informal changes accumulate over time, gradually expanding scope.

How It Appears

- “Just a small enhancement”
- Mid-iteration adjustments
- Direct stakeholder requests

Consequence

- Loss of baseline
- Budget creep
- Schedule instability

Key Lesson

> Scope rarely explodes—it grows quietly.

Prevention

- Enforce change control consistently
- Document all changes
- Avoid in-iteration scope adjustments

Pattern 3: “Within Tolerance” Masks Real Problems

Description

Performance remains technically within thresholds, but trends indicate deterioration.

How It Appears

- Slight velocity decline each iteration
- Gradual increase in defects
- Budget creeping upward

Consequence

- Late recognition of problems
- Reactive instead of proactive management

Key Lesson

> Compliance does not equal control.

Prevention

- Monitor trends, not just thresholds
- Act on patterns early
- Avoid relying solely on tolerance limits

Pattern 4: Resource Expansion Creates Instability

Description

Adding resources to accelerate delivery introduces coordination overhead and quality variation.

How It Appears

- Increased defects after onboarding
- Slower velocity despite more people
- Communication breakdown

Consequence

- Temporary instability
- Increased QA effort
- Delayed recovery

Key Lesson

> More resources do not immediately mean more progress.

Prevention

- Plan onboarding carefully
- Limit late-stage resource expansion
- Stabilize before scaling

Pattern 5: Fixing the System Breaks the System

Description

Refactoring or improvement efforts introduce regression defects and instability.

How It Appears

- Reopened defects
- New defects in previously stable areas
- Increased QA cycles

Consequence

- Loss of stakeholder confidence
- Schedule delays
- Increased cost

Key Lesson

> Every improvement introduces risk.

Prevention

- Phase changes carefully
- Increase testing during refactoring
- Avoid large-scale changes during critical phases

Pattern 6: Stakeholder Expectations Outpace Reality

Description

Stakeholders begin expecting more than what was originally planned or agreed.

How It Appears

- “Since it’s already there…”
- Pressure for enhancements
- Requests driven by demos

Consequence

- Scope expansion
- Misalignment
- Frustration

Key Lesson

> Delivered features become expected features.

Prevention

- Manage expectations continuously
- Communicate scope boundaries clearly
- Separate demo from production capability

Pattern 7: Control Weakens After Success

Description

As the project stabilizes, discipline relaxes and informal behavior returns.

How It Appears

- Informal backlog changes
- Reduced documentation
- Faster but uncontrolled decisions

Consequence

- Re-emergence of drift
- Loss of control
- Repetition of earlier problems

Key Lesson

> Success creates complacency.

Prevention

- Maintain discipline even during stability
- Reinforce processes consistently
- Monitor for early signs of drift

Pattern 8: Overcontrol Reduces Delivery Effectiveness

Description

Strict enforcement of processes slows execution and creates friction.

How It Appears

- Excessive approvals
- Slower turnaround
- Team frustration

Consequence

- Reduced velocity
- Vendor dissatisfaction
- Delayed delivery

Key Lesson

> Too much control is as harmful as too little.

Prevention

- Introduce controlled flexibility
- Define thresholds for exceptions
- Balance discipline with efficiency

Pattern 9: Budget Drift Follows Scope Drift

Description

Financial overrun is often a consequence of accumulated scope changes.

How It Appears

- Incremental increases in effort
- QA expansion
- Rework costs

Consequence

- Budget overrun
- Executive escalation
- Loss of financial control

Key Lesson

> Cost is a reflection of decisions, not just effort.

Prevention

- Track budget continuously
- Link cost to scope decisions
- Act early on variance trends

Pattern 10: Control Lost Must Be Rebuilt—Deliberately

Description

Once control is lost, it cannot be restored passively.

How It Appears

- Scope misalignment
- Baseline mismatch
- Conflicting expectations

Consequence

- Need for realignment
- Contract adjustments
- Project disruption

Key Lesson

> Control must be actively re-established.

Prevention

- Reset baseline when needed
- Formalize changes
- Reintroduce discipline intentionally

Final Insight

Across all scenarios, one principle remains consistent:

> Projects do not fail suddenly.
> They fail through patterns that go unrecognized.

The role of the Project Manager is not just to respond to problems.

It is to:

- Recognize patterns
- Intervene early
- Maintain discipline
- Make informed trade-offs

Closing Thought

Every scenario in Project Reckon represents a different situation.

But the patterns behind them are the same.

Mastering these patterns is what separates:

> Projects followers
>
> from
>
> Proect leaders

This page titled Bonus Material is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

Templates and Tools Library

Project Reckon Practicum

Purpose of This Section

This section provides the core tools used throughout the Project Reckon practicum. These templates are not theoretical. They reflect the actual artifacts required to manage scope, budget, risk, vendor alignment, and execution control. Each tool should be used consistently across all scenarios. Together, they form a complete project control system.

Template 1 — Project Status & Response Memo

Used by the Project Manager to respond to vendor updates and communicate decisions to ZynoxDev and internal stakeholders. Complete after every significant vendor communication or status change.

Template 2 — Risk Register

Tracks risks across all scenarios and identifies patterns early. Categorize each risk by type: Scope, Schedule, Budget, Quality, Architecture, Vendor, or Stakeholder. Score by likelihood and impact. Update after every scenario.

Template 3 — Change Control Log

Tracks all scope changes and prevents informal expansion. No change exists unless it is logged. Use change types: Scope Expansion, Clarification, Enhancement, Defect Fix, or Refactoring.

Template 4 — Budget Tracking Log

Tracks financial performance period by period and identifies cost drift. For each variance, determine whether it is temporary or structural, whether it is justified, and what action is required.

Template 5 — Budget Summary Dashboard

Provides a rolled-up view of planned versus actual spend across Development and QA. Use alongside the Budget Tracking Log to communicate financial status to leadership.

Template 6 — Project Dashboard

Provides a single view of overall project health across Scope, Schedule, Budget, Quality, and Risk. Use red, yellow, and green status indicators. Include trend direction for velocity, defects, and budget.

Template 7 — Change Request Form

Used to formally evaluate and approve scope changes. Every change must have a documented description, justification, impact analysis across scope, cost, and schedule, and a recorded decision.

Template 8 — Final Delivery Checklist

Ensures readiness before release. All six items must be confirmed before delivery is approved: core features complete, no critical defects, integration validated, performance acceptable, documentation complete, and stakeholder approval obtained.

How These Tools Work Together

Projects fail when these tools are not used together. Control requires visibility, discipline, and consistency.

— The Risk Register tracks uncertainty. — The Change Log tracks scope decisions. — The Budget Tracker tracks cost. — The Dashboard summarizes status. — The Memo Template communicates decisions.

Structured thinking → controlled execution → successful delivery.

Replace each [Download Template N] with your actual file link.

This page titled Templates and Tools Library is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.

Decision Frameworks

Project Reckon Practicum — Structured Thinking for Project Execution

Purpose of This Section

Throughout Project Reckon, you will be required to make decisions under uncertainty, with incomplete information, and under stakeholder pressure. These ten frameworks provide structured ways to think through those decisions. They are not rules. They are tools. Use them consistently across every scenario.

Framework 1 — Issue Identification Framework

Before making any decision, correctly identify the actual issue — not the symptom. This framework guides you through three diagnostic questions: What is the actual issue? Is it isolated or a pattern? What type of issue is it?

Framework 2 — Scope & Change Control Decision Framework

Use this whenever a new request appears. Every change must pass through a four-step evaluation: Is it in scope? What is the impact? Should it be approved now? What action is required? If it is not formally approved, it should not be done.

Framework 3 — When to Escalate

Escalation is a leadership decision, not a reflex. This framework defines the conditions that require escalation — visible patterns, exceeded thresholds, vendor breakdown, material financial risk — and distinguishes them from situations that should be handled locally.

Framework 4 — Stabilize vs. Continue Decision

Used when system performance degrades. Guides you through three steps: Is stability at risk? Is the risk short-term or structural? Which path do you choose — continue, stabilize, or rollback? Stability is the foundation of progress.

Framework 5 — Budget Decision Framework

Use when cost variance appears. Determines whether the variance is temporary or structural, whether the cost is justified, and what action to take: accept, investigate, reduce cost, or adjust scope. Cost reflects decisions, not just effort.

Framework 6 — Vendor Management Framework

Used when vendor behavior or performance is questioned. Guides you through three steps: Is the vendor aligned? Is the issue contract-based or performance-based? Which approach is appropriate — clarify, direct, escalate, or adjust expectations? Vendor management is about alignment, not control.

Framework 7 — Control vs. Flexibility Framework

Used when balancing discipline and agility. Recognizes the risks of both too much control — scope drift, budget creep, loss of predictability — and too little — slow delivery, friction, reduced responsiveness. Effective management is balance, not extremes.

Framework 8 — Risk Evaluation Framework

A four-step framework applied continuously throughout project execution: Identify the risk. Assess likelihood and impact. Decide on a response — mitigate, accept, avoid, or escalate. Monitor and update. Risk is not the problem. Unmanaged risk is.

Framework 9 — Go / No-Go Decision Framework

Used at final delivery. Evaluates five criteria before release: system functionality, defect level, remaining risks, cost of delay, and stakeholder approval. A project is released when risk is acceptable — not when it is zero.

Framework 10 — Reflection Framework

Used after project completion. Asks four questions: Where did control break down? What signals were missed? Which decisions mattered most? What would you do differently? The value of a project is in what it teaches.

How to Use These Frameworks

These frameworks are not sequential. You will not use them in order. You will reach for the one that fits the situation in front of you. Over time, applying them consistently builds judgment — the ability to know which decision to make when the steps are not enough.

All decisions in this practicum follow a simple pattern:

Identify the issue → Recognize the pattern → Evaluate the risk → Understand the trade-offs → Make a decision → Accept the consequences.

This page titled Decision Frameworks is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Sukhjit "Bob" Singh.