Building confidence in executing IT programs

How proactive program risk management provides confidence in achieving program success
Introduction ..........................................1
Project execution continues to struggle...3
Program risk management is important for project success ..........9
How well are your important projects doing? .........................12
Are your people aligned toward success? ............................15
Benefiting from independent program risk management .............19
Conclusion ............................................23

This insight on governance, risk and compliance (GRC) is part of a series of boardroom reports focused on program risk management (PRM) – please see ey.com/ prm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insight on GRC thought leadership</th>
<th>Portfolio management transformation</th>
<th>Building confidence in executing IT programs</th>
<th>Predicting project risks improves success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ey.com/ portfoliomanage</td>
<td>ey.com/itprm</td>
<td>ey.com/predictingrisk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key questions
• Are you doing the right projects?
• How well are your important projects doing?
• Are your people aligned toward success?
• Are you ready to run a major project?
• Is the project set up for success?

Who would be interested on?
• COOs/CEOs/CIOs who are interested in developing competitive advantage by outperforming their peers in program execution
• CIOs who want insight into potential program performance issues prior to budget and time overruns
• CFOs who want to understand what drives program success and how to better predict program issues and performance
• CIOs who are interested in effectively and successfully managing programs
• CFOs who are interested in maximizing the value of their capital investments
• CEOs/COOs who are interested in effectively and successfully managing programs
• CEOs/COOs who are interested in best support business success
• COOs/CEOs/CIOs who are interested in selecting those projects that are aligned with their organization’s vision and best support business success

Portfolio management transformation ey.com/portfoliomanage
Building confidence in executing IT programs ey.com/itprm
Predicting project risks improves success ey.com/predictingrisk
Introduction

IT program success supports business success

This is an important time for organizations to review how they plan, execute and realize benefits from strategic IT programs.

Organizations continue to look to IT as a key enabler to help them realize business strategies, improve productivity and obtain a competitive advantage through product and service innovation. IT is a focal point for executives who seek to drive cost competitiveness and transformation agendas that are now a common part of the interrelated global economy.

However, even as IT investments are expected to continue a growth pattern in the coming years, strategic IT program success rates are still significantly underperforming and in need of attention by organizations looking to unlock the value of their capital investments.

The complexity of strategic IT programs is greater than ever, but so are expectations. Organizations are realizing that they must respond to increasing pressure to improve the return on their program investments. Today’s strategic IT programs are expected to be delivered on time and on budget, but more importantly, to deliver multiple, high-level business benefits. Unfortunately, that is not the case in most companies today.

Key issues leading to failures in IT programs are often identified too late, often after the failure has occurred – resulting in limited mitigation options that are costly to resolve. By the time issues are identified (usually in a crisis), the ability to influence a positive outcome is greatly reduced, and the opportunity for effective damage control is severely limited and may be missed altogether.

Organizations need to challenge their current situation and ask how they can better manage risks around underperforming programs and improve performance rates to deliver sustained benefits. IT program risk management (PRM) provides an effective platform to help increase the success of strategic IT initiatives. IT PRM helps to protect organizations from experiencing common IT program pitfalls and increases the likelihood of delivering successful program outcomes.
Project execution continues to struggle

**IT spending increases**

EY has identified the top three business drivers for IT spending in the coming year:

1. Internal process efficiency and agility
2. Enhanced customer experience
3. Innovation to drive competitive advantage

IT research and advisory firm Gartner has indicated that worldwide IT expenditure in 2014 is estimated at US$3.8t, a 3.2% increase from 2013. Gartner predicts an increase in IT spending will be sustained at an average rate of 4% per year through 2017. Gartner also indicates that approximately 20% to 35% of a company’s IT spending will be focused on programs and projects, depending on an organization’s initiatives. Looking at just programs and projects, this represents an investment of approximately US$760b to US$1.33t; this is a significant investment requiring more scrutiny and a high degree of confidence in achieving the intended return on investment.

**Digital technologies grow in importance**

Digital technologies are fundamentally changing the ways in which consumers interact with organizations and, at the same time, are creating new business models at the heart of these organizations. These technologies, including social media, enterprise mobility, data analytics and cloud (commonly known as SMAC), are rapidly emerging as disruptive forces for organizations across all industries. These changes in technology, and the manner of deployment and use, require proper adaptation of project design and implementation to be successful.

Organizations are increasingly competing on innovation in new products and services, with IT and emerging technologies seen as both a risk and an opportunity for companies wishing to differentiate themselves in the market and to improve their productivity and performance. Organizations have little choice but to continuously invest in IT and IT programs, or they risk suffering the consequences of an aging and underperforming application and infrastructure landscape, ultimately affecting the organization’s competitiveness. To be successful, this requires improved approaches to program management to transform the good ideas into great outcomes.
Half of all IT programs underperform

With few exceptions, organizations across all industries continue to show poor performance in successfully delivering IT programs, achieving expected outcomes and sustaining benefits. Reports by McKinsey show that approximately half of IT programs with budgets over US$15m miss timelines, go over budget and/or don’t produce expected outcomes. Most alarming is that 17% of IT programs are planned and executed so poorly that they can threaten the very existence of the company.

While companies have invested significantly in increasing their knowledge and capabilities in program and project management, this investment is not reflected in program success rates. The lack of improvement is mainly due to improper program adaptation to the increased complexity in business processes and in the emerging technology landscape. There are consistent patterns associated with challenged programs by organizations that fail to recognize, quantify and then properly adapt their program approaches, governance, processes and controls for program complexity.
A crucial differentiator for corporate competitiveness

Effective program and project management capabilities are now one of the most crucial differentiators for competitiveness in the future marketplace. Given the focus on investing in IT, getting strategic IT programs right could be the make-or-break difference between realizing business growth and being a market leader, or being left behind.

While today's mainstream thinking is that strategic IT programs need to deliver sustainable business benefits that enable a competitive advantage, many continue to be focused on the more traditional measures — delivering on time and within cost budget. In daily program operations, teams have not changed their operational behavior of focusing on primarily schedule and cost objectives, and when faced with trade-off decisions that could impact the achievement of benefits, time and cost usually win. Therefore, the benefits of the capital investment are marginalized, often without the knowledge of the key stakeholders.

The failure of strategic IT programs can leave companies exposed to significant increases in costs, reputational damage, loss of customers, and the disruption of day-to-day activities. And these risks are increasing. In the future, organizations that fail to manage their strategic IT programs, based on realizing business benefits and contributions to innovation and competitive advantage, will find it increasingly difficult to remain relevant to their workforce, customers and the broader market in which they operate, and they will become laggards in their respective industries.

A new way of thinking and managing strategic programs must be inculcated within all levels of the project structures to maximize investment outcomes.

The reasons for IT program failure

There are usually many intertwined factors that result in an IT program failing to deliver its intended objectives and benefits. There are typically a number of risks that, when combined, result in programs failing or underperforming. Many of these risks are inherent in the program at the start and go undetected until the later stages of the program, and then symptomatic issues spring up as "surprises."

Management needs to be aware of the organization's specific IT program-risk universe and implement strategies up front to manage the most likely risks to program success. The most common causes of complex IT program failures are outlined in the following chart.

17% of IT programs are planned and executed so poorly that they can threaten the very existence of the company.
EY has found that successful companies take the time to have effective pre-start reviews that assist in determining the degree of readiness in these critical areas; whereas unsuccessful organizations tend to wait until the symptoms of unresolved risks and issues actually arise and then react by “firefighting” with problem solving and minimally effective decision-making.

Figure 2: IT program risk universe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision and Initiation</th>
<th>Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of management support for the program</td>
<td>• Aggressive schedule commitments restricting proper planning phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unresolved or uncertain project vision or strategy</td>
<td>• Inappropriate skills, resources and processes in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poorly defined business objectives</td>
<td>• Inadequate understanding of complexities and accounting for factors necessary to succeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poorly defined project scope and requirements analysis</td>
<td>• Ineffective prequalification process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inadequate assessment of business impact or priority</td>
<td>• Incomplete project charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poorly defined critical success factors and risk assessment</td>
<td>• Poorly defined contractual terms and conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of complexity measurement</td>
<td>• Lack of definition of appropriate performance metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unclear governance and decision framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of communication and user-group involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Governance model fails to manage key project internal and external stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ineffective project management systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ineffective project performance monitoring and reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of continuity in project staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ineffective communication with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of situational awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inadequate risk assessment, quantification and allocation of project risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incomplete or unrealistic cost information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ineffective governance mechanisms and inconsistent decision framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inadequate representation of the “voice of the customer”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shifting budget, scope and timetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adversarial team and supplier relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of skills or resources in program and project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adequate risk assessment, quantification and allocation of project risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ineffective control of change orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ineffective decision-making and resolution of issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor quality management and assurance plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incomplete design information and changing design and scope requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of a risk management framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of independent progress monitoring and executive reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of tracking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measuring and visualizing the complexity drivers of risks on a project allows early proactive measures to be taken to address these drivers and reduce the remaining risk to an acceptable level.
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Program risk management is important for program success

Using IT PRM to build additional lines of defense

The poor historical performance of IT programs and the magnitude of investments in IT are forcing organizations to take new measures to increase the confidence in attaining the expected benefits. They are adapting their approach and enhancing controls and risk management over their strategic IT programs.

Organizations are strengthening their controls by:

1. Appointing experienced risk managers and a risk committee to take charge of the management of end-to-end program risk: this is in addition to the traditional role that a project management office (PMO) undertakes to track and report project risks and issues.

2. Enhancing the role of internal audit, compliance and enterprise risk functions to provide assurance coverage at selected decision points during the implementation of the program.

3. Appointing an external independent PRM provider who is charged with bringing experience and providing a forward-looking and predictive view of risk: the reasons are that these capabilities are typically not readily available inside the company, or that other suppliers (e.g., system integrators) cannot provide true objectivity due to conflicts of interest.

IT PRM focuses on providing a clear understanding of the current program issues environment and a full life cycle, forward-looking view of risks. This holistic overview of issues, risks and complexities allows informed decisions to be taken at the earliest possible time and leads to improved program performance and enhanced benefit realization. A proven method is to create multiple “lines of defense” against the threats and reduce the impact of realized risks.

- First line of defense: the most crucial layer of risk management on a program. It typically includes the executive leadership team, program steering committee, program risk committee, technical design authority, the PMO, system integrators (SIs) and the various project work stream leaders.

- Second line of defense: an independent IT PRM role. It can be provided by one independent (mostly external) party, or it can include a combination of internal and external providers, such as an independent (external) program risk and quality assurance provider, operational risk and compliance functions, external auditors and even software providers.

- Third line of defense: typically includes the audit committee and internal audit function; often seen as the last line of defense when it comes to detecting error and waste in organizational activities. These functions often benefit from being able to rely on the outputs of a trusted independent party who can focus better on selected areas of oversight; it may even reduce the need for their oversight in other program risk and assurance activities.
Figure 3: Lines of defense

Independent IT PRM communicates the program and project delivery teams’ activities to executive management (e.g., main board) and the stakeholders who operate in the third line of defense, such as the board’s audit committee and internal audit function.

The IT PRM function acts independently of the project delivery team (first line of defense). It often consists of those experienced with program risk for other companies and industries providing a “trusted advisor” with a fresh, independent perspective that includes providing assurance and review activities. The leader of the IT PRM function will typically also sit on the steering committee in an independent capacity to challenge and advise on program progress and trade-off decisions.
Key roles

- **Main board** ("heartbeat"): responsible for providing overall portfolio and program direction and accountable for corporate-level risk management.

- **Executive leadership team**: provides program sponsorship, strategy and direction. Responsible for sign-off of: scope; functional, technical and service solutions; and changes to spending; also for monitoring of program plan, budget, risks, issues and change requests.

- **Portfolio risk committee**: responsible and accountable for providing overall portfolio risk management oversight and portfolio and program-level risk management. Seeks interventions to address any concerns across portfolio.

- **Audit committee**: assists the board by setting the agenda for and receiving reports related to the effectiveness of risk management on the project and the effectiveness of controls within key business processes.

- **Internal audit**: typically will have some responsibility for providing independent assurance to the audit committee on the effectiveness of internal controls within key business processes on change programs.

- **Steering committees**: responsible for ensuring strong buy-in for the solution and that all stakeholder groups are represented appropriately. Accountable for effective governance and planning, sign-off of quality deliverables; and ensuring that the solution and business change meets business and user requirements.

- **Technical design authority**: responsible for the technical review of solution and ensuring adherence to technical architecture principles of the organization.

- **Program management office**: provides day-to-day management controls over the project, including management of project plan, budget, risks and issues. Responsible for communicating effectively with governance groups, raising risks and issues and required sign-offs.

- **Independent PRM**: responsible for independently reviewing and advising on the effectiveness of risk management at the program level, including the effectiveness of mitigation strategies for key program risks.

- **Project workstreams**: responsible for day-to-day project delivery and the management of project risk.
Clear, accurate communication within an IT PRM framework is essential. Key stakeholders need relevant and timely information and recommendations so they can make fact-based decisions to mitigate risks and improve project outcomes.

All too often, project status reporting does not give leadership a true picture of how a project is doing until it is too late. There is usually political pressure to keep a project in a “green” status until it is no longer possible to hide issues and challenges and the project suddenly goes to “red” status. There is also a tendency for risk and status to get distorted as it is rolled up from the work stream level to the project level to the executive reporting level; this political pressure and distortion results in a loss of transparency, causing executives to have unwarranted optimism concerning true project performance and its expected outcomes. Unfortunately, this almost always leads to surprises arising late in project execution, with reduced ability to mitigate the negative impacts to the planned project outcomes.

To address this lack of transparency, EY has produced a multidimensional framework to communicate a risk state view of an IT project. This framework is known as the PRM Cube: this has three domains – program governance, project management and technical solution – with each domain having nine facets. The risk state of the program is determined by assessing the risk of each of the 27 facets, based on the type and complexity of the project. Red facets represent high risk areas that require immediate attention and significant changes to processes. Amber facets represent moderate risk areas that require some modification of processes. Green facets represent low risk areas that should be monitored.

After the baseline risk state is identified, the desired risk state can be determined and remediation plans put into place. When determining the desired risk state, the goal is not necessarily to get the entire cube to a green state. The goal should be to focus on the root-cause issues driving the current risk state and develop a set of remediation plans to address those issues. Once the project is at an acceptable risk state, based on the risk tolerance of the organization, the risk state should be assessed on a regular basis, such as at stage gate reviews.
A typical progression

Current state → Step 1 → Step 2 → Step 3

The diagram above shows an example of a risk-state analysis. The red areas represent the highest risks that should be addressed first. From this initial analysis, a desired risk state should be determined (which may not be all “green”), then remediation plans can be developed to get to the desired risk state. Again, there are dependencies among the areas, so certain red areas may need to be addressed prior to others.

A typical progression

Current state → Step 1 → Step 2 → Step 3
Are your people aligned toward success?

Decisions are constantly being made throughout the life of a project at all levels, both internally and externally, every day. EY’s experience has shown that a majority of these decisions are made by the project team with only a relative few being made by executives. These constant, day-to-day decisions determine the direction and success of the project. If decisions are aligned along the same priorities, the project will progress much more smoothly and efficiently with few decision delays and revisiting of decisions. However, if decisions are not aligned with executive priorities, or executives have competing priorities among themselves, then competing forces may cause the decisions to be revisited, overruled or be delayed, as executives negotiate among themselves — this will cause the project to struggle and not achieve success.

From our work with challenged organizations, we have found that when decision alignment is poor:

- Decisions are revisited and overturned as stakeholders with higher authority change decisions to align with their own priorities.
- Decisions are delayed as the team tries to get consensus among stakeholders with competing priorities.
- The team becomes frustrated and refuses to make decisions that they are responsible for, delaying risk and issue escalation (passive-aggressive), or they start making decisions not aligned with the overall project success.

Poor decision priority alignment occurs more frequently on large complex projects, since there are many more communication points between executives and the project team. This means that only select information is communicated, less often and more formally than on smaller projects.

Decision priority analysis

The governance of a project can be divided into three distinct tiers — executives (sponsor, steering committee, executive leadership team, etc.), leads (PM, PMO, architects, etc.), and teams (work stream leads). EY utilizes six success factors when analyzing decisions — **time, cost, benefits, scope, quality** and **team organization**.

Effective decision-making is achieved when each tier’s top priorities are in agreement within tiers (horizontally) and between tiers (vertically) and our analysis can provide visibility into that horizontal and vertical alignment. When misalignment occurs, EY has found that there is a tendency for resources to align with the priorities of their functional areas, i.e., finance resources will align with the priorities of the CFO (usually “cost” and “benefits”), IT resources will align with the priorities of the CIO (usually “time” and “cost”) and operations resources will align with the priorities of the COO (usually “scope” and “quality”). This is why prior to the start of the project, the priorities of the six success factors must be agreed upon and communicated to the governing bodies and the project team.

It is critical that priorities are aligned throughout the project so that the project team makes decisions that are aligned with leadership’s definition of success.
EY’s experience when seeing misalignment across and between the governance tiers is usually, if not always, associated with a challenged and/or failed program.

A visually depicted decision framework helps to determine if a priority misalignment exists within and across governance tiers (including suppliers) that could lead to decision-making disconnects on the project – a key reason why many projects become challenged.

The graphs below show the priorities of the six factors by each resource within the tier; each line corresponds to one resource’s priorities. As you can easily see, there is significant misalignment both within each governance tier and between governance tiers and little hope for aligned trade-off decisions in achieving success; as success has many and inconsistent decisions.
Empowerment alignment

Along with decision priority alignment, it is necessary to examine the empowerment alignment among the previously mentioned six success factors. Prior to the project start, leadership should determine the definition of success based on the relative priority of the six factors. At most, two of these factors should be the primary definition of success for the project. The other factors are successively lower priority in the definition of success. For example, if the project must achieve the expected benefits (i.e., return on investment) and is cost critical (i.e., ROI is very sensitive to cost), then benefits and cost would be the two primary factors of success. The other four factors must be given some freedom to change to allow the team to meet the primary goals.

Well aligned empowerment levels and escalation thresholds allow project leadership to make meaningful trade-off decisions, within their decision rights. Lack of well aligned empowerment levels will hinder the project team from making effective trade-offs decisions, or frustrate executives by having the project leadership change factors that they consider critical to success. Using our previous example, if benefits and cost are critical to project success, project leadership should have little empowerment to change those factors. On the other hand, project leadership should be able to change (within thresholds) the other factors of time, benefits, scope, quality and organizational impact. If the project leadership lacks real empowerment to change those non-priority areas, they will quickly become frustrated by the lack of any ability to make meaningful trade-off decisions and will need to escalate many such decisions to executives.

The above graph shows both the priority (yellow) and the empowerment (gray) levels for project leadership for each of the six success factors. In this example, scope and benefits are the highest priorities (yellow). However, project leadership has a relatively high empowerment level to change scope, which is not consistent with its priority with executives. Executives may want to revisit the empowerment levels to better align priority and empowerment. It is important to note that all empowerment levels must also include defined escalation thresholds.
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Benefiting from independent program risk management

In order to establish an effective PRM capability, a phased service implementation approach is recommended:

1. **Individual assessments**
   
   Start developing a PRM capability by executing several individual assessments to determine the ability to support the assessments and the value to the organization. This allows the organization to pilot PRM to determine what works and steer the focus for greatest impact. If the organization decides to expand PRM, this step allows them to decide if they need a managed service or if they need to co-source the PRM capability.

2. **Fully managed service**
   
   If the resources or knowledge do not exist within the organization to co-source a PRM capability, a managed service option will enable a quick deployment of PRM. This option allows a fully functioning PRM capability to be established within the organization that can later be transitioned to internal resources.

3. **Co-sourcing service**
   
   If the organization has a capability similar to PRM, or wants to leverage a leading practice approach, co-sourcing the PRM organization may be the best approach. This option is also a logical follow-on to the fully managed service where the organization introduces its own resources to PRM and starts the transfer of knowledge — this may eventually lead to the organization taking over all the PRM capability.

4. **Subscription service**
   
   Once the PRM capability is established within the organization and is well understood by its resources, a subscription service is the next logical step. A subscription service allows the organization to maintain access to select leading practice toolsets, while minimizing the fees for external resources; yet, it still also allows access to the external resources for short-term capacity expansion or for assistance in assessing exceptionally complex programs.

While helping clients with their strategic projects, EY has gained an understanding of when and where projects get off track, and on the interdependency of the root causes of issues and risks that result in poor project performance. We have developed practical and innovative ways to help you identify the right projects to undertake, assess whether you are ready to execute them, predict where they will struggle, identify the root causes of current issues, determine if the project team is aligned to your executives’ definition of success and, most importantly, what decisions and actions are needed.
High value at relatively low cost

Investments in PRM are typically quite small compared to the overall program budgets, especially when business revenues are put at risk. Independent IT PRM services should account for approximately 2% to 6% of the overall program budget, although this may vary depending on the project’s risk profile, and some of the more mature program organizations are investing more.

While the costs are relatively low, the benefits of PRM are significant:

- Increased confidence in the integrity of business case and projected outcomes
- Increased likelihood that the program will be delivered successfully
- Improved visibility and transparency of program risks and performance
- Early identification of program-critical risks and issues
- Practical recommendations to address problems as they arise
- More informed decision-making as a result of independent viewpoint
- Access to independent professional advice on leading program practices
- Enhanced management control of the program
- Significantly reduced late-stage surprises
- Improved team dynamics, energy and capabilities
Questions to build program confidence

There are many questions about confidence elements of large IT programs that must be answered to build and sustain confidence in the program's ability to deliver. In the absence of an independent analysis of program risk, management's challenge is to determine how well it can trust the information that is being provided to it. The question asked increasingly by executives entrusted with IT programs is: “What confidence do I have in the performance and expected outcomes of the programs we are undertaking?”

Can you answer these key IT investment questions?
1. What are the top three to five most critical programs for my company?
   • How confident am I that these critical programs are on track from a cost and schedule performance perspective?
2. How transparent are the costs, schedules and quality of performance, and what degree of confidence do I have in the future performance in these areas?
3. How confident am I that the programs will be able to achieve and sustain the projected benefits? What is the basis of that confidence?
4. What key decisions need to be made now to enhance program performance and maximize benefit delivery?
5. What is the past success rate of projects and programs in terms of budget, time, stakeholder satisfaction and benefits achievement?
6. Is our program portfolio aligned to the company strategy and optimized to maximize our investment spending?
Conclusion

IT PRM risk-based analysis builds confidence in IT programs

A holistic view of issues, risks and complexities throughout a program's life cycle allows informed decisions to be made at the earliest possible time; leading to improved program performance and enhanced benefit realization.

Program risk management is the start of a journey focusing on improving the outcomes through risk management in major change programs and projects.

The results of an initial assessment can highlight a number of next steps, including:

- Assistance in individual assessments for key programs and projects
- The need for increased program risk management capability for ongoing assessments and continued monitoring
- Improvement of the program risk management solutions and enablers
- Predictive analytics and root-cause analysis and modeling of key relationships between key project factors
- Analysis to highlight hidden issues, risk and identification of the root cause of issues such as a detailed program schedule analysis
- Utilization of analytics simulations to predict program outcomes to undertake appropriate actions if necessary

You can build confidence in IT programs through forward-looking IT PRM risk-based analysis, good information and deep perspective to enable value delivery. Engaging the right IT PRM provider will ultimately help build and sustain the confidence of key stakeholders and ensure that you have the right information at the earliest possible time to make well-informed proactive decisions throughout your program.

How can EY help?

We can help you gain a holistic, fact-based objective risk view, from project selection to portfolio development, to project planning and through project execution, that will help you unlock the value of your program investments. The differentiator is our ability to anticipate risks, understanding their future impacts and thereby making informed decisions to improve program performance. We can help your organization regain control of your IT programs and deliver meaningful value, fully aligned with your organization’s business strategy and risk tolerance.
Want to learn more?

*Insights on governance, risk and compliance* is an ongoing series of thought leadership reports focused on IT and other business risks and the many related challenges and opportunities. These timely and topical publications are designed to help you understand the issues and provide you with valuable insights about our perspective. Please visit our *Insights on governance, risk and compliance* series at [ey.com/grcinsights](http://ey.com/grcinsights).

- **Unlocking the value of your program investments**: how predictive analytics can help in achieving successful outcomes  
  [ey.com/prm](http://ey.com/prm)

- **Portfolio management transformation**: how to effectively screen and align your program portfolio with strategic objectives  
  [ey.com/portfoliomanage](http://ey.com/portfoliomanage)

- **Predicting project risks improves success**: how predictive analytics provides the insight to unlock the value of your program investments  
  [ey.com/predictingrisk](http://ey.com/predictingrisk)

- **Cyber program management**: identifying ways to get ahead of cybercrime  
  [ey.com/cpm](http://ey.com/cpm)

- **Expecting more from risk management**: drive business results through harnessing uncertainty  
  [ey.com/repm](http://ey.com/repm)

- **Maximizing value from your lines of defense**: a pragmatic approach to establishing and optimizing your LOD model  
  [ey.com/iod](http://ey.com/iod)

- **Get ahead of cybercrime**: EY’s Global Information Security Survey 2014  
  [ey.com/giss](http://ey.com/giss)

- **Centralized operations**: the future of operating models for Risk, Control and Compliance functions  
  [ey.com/centralops](http://ey.com/centralops)

- **Building trust in the cloud**: creating confidence in your cloud ecosystem  
  [ey.com/cloudtrust](http://ey.com/cloudtrust)
If there's no reward without risk, can risk be a good thing?

Every challenge and every opportunity an organization faces today demands change. And with change comes risk. Some risks you can see, some you can predict, some you can plan for, and some you can’t.

For EY Advisory, a better working world means solving big, complex industry issues and capitalizing on opportunities to help deliver outcomes that grow, optimize and protect our clients’ businesses.

Our understanding of the issues around risk – about the risks you can see as well as the ones you can’t – inspire us to ask better questions. By teaming globally with you we co-create more innovative answers that help you see risk management as a means to accelerate your performance.

Together, we help you deliver better outcomes and long-lasting results, from strategy to execution.

The better the question. The better the answer. The better the world works.
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