

workfront

The Unnerving Cost of IT Project Management



EXECUTIVE BRIEF



Executive summary

In any IT Department, the lack of the right work management solution can severely impact the success of projects, prevent companies from meeting their objectives, and have a long-term detrimental impact on the business.¹ While a comprehensive, modern work management solution exists, decision-makers often hesitate to act in today's tight-budget environment.

Staying with the status quo or implementing a partial solution is not only ineffective at solving work management issues, but could be costing enterprises millions of dollars every year.

Read on to understand:

- High costs of today's work practices (including the real cost of status meetings)
- Common solutions and why they fail
- Benefits of a modern work management platform
- Price of inaction or implementing a less effective solution
- Solutions vetted to increase productivity, on-time delivery, strategic alignment, etc.

The information in this white paper will help you build a clear case for implementing a comprehensive modern work management platform to ensure operational excellence. The business case will prove that you can reduce current costs, deliver a strong return on investment (ROI), and move the entire enterprise closer to achieving strategic goals.

The current process for project management is broken.

Project leaders and IT directors, like you, are working with a process that wasn't built for the speed and complexity of today's work. On average, large IT projects run 45% over budget and 7% over time, while delivering 56% less value than predicted. In fact, 17 percent of IT projects go so bad that they can threaten the very existence of the company.² Traditional project management is often broken. Whether you work in technology, manufacturing, healthcare, or finance, your team is most likely haunted by manual processes, scattered stakeholders, and these five common pain points:

1. Constant status inquiries
2. Poor or no visibility into your team's workload
3. Multiple, disconnected tools
4. Requests from everywhere
5. Mixed methodologies

While the majority of project managers don't lack proper training (in fact, 84% report that they have formal project management training and/or certifications),³ the speed and complexity of business has changed over the years and will continue to evolve. Competition, technology, and a global economy create a work space that becomes chaotic very quickly.

Let's break down the five reasons project management in today's world is broken and how your team measures up.

1. Constant status inquiries

Project leaders spend up to 10 hours per week in meetings and 90% report that more than half that time is wasted.⁴ And office workers? They're spending an average of four hours per week in meetings with a mutual feeling that more than half that time is wasted.⁷

And status updating? The majority of project managers report that they spend between 21%–30% of their time updating status reports, tracking down updates, and attending status meetings.⁵ That's up to 12 hours per week spent on status updating, an incredible cost to the organization's bottom line.

UNDERSTANDING THE PROCESS:

- When your boss asks for a status update on all of your projects, how do you find that information?
- Do you have to manually find information from each team member?
- Do you have to log in to multiple tools to access status updates?
- Are you required to present data in different formats for each stakeholder?

UNDERSTANDING THE COST:

- How many meetings do you attend each week?
- How much time do you spend in meetings each week?
- How long do you spend preparing for meetings each week?
- How many project managers are involved in each meeting?
- How many individual contributors are involved in each meeting?

EVALUATION ► STATUS MEETINGS

Information below is based on a 30-person team with a blended rate of \$70/hour. See Appendix A.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| Average # of weekly meetings | 5 |
| Average length of meeting (in hours) | 1 |
| Hours per week in meetings | 150 |
| Weekly costs of status meetings | \$10,500 |
| Monthly costs of status meetings | \$42,000 |
| Yearly costs of status meetings | \$504,000 |

FINDING THE RIGHT SOLUTION ► STATUS MEETINGS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Reduce # of hours spent in status meetings by % | 50% |
| # Of hours spent in status meetings | 75 |
| Weekly savings | \$5,250 |
| Monthly savings | \$21,000 |
| Yearly savings | \$252,000 |

EVALUATION ► STATUS UPDATES

Information below is based on a blended rate of \$70/hour.

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Average # of team members gathering updates | 5 |
| Average # of hours per team member spent gathering updates each week | 6 |
| Average # of hours spent each week gathering status updates | 30 |
| Weekly cost of gathering status updates | \$2,100 |
| Monthly cost of gathering status updates | \$8,400 |
| Yearly cost of gathering status updates | \$100,800 |

FINDING THE RIGHT SOLUTION ► STATUS UPDATES

| | |
|---|----------|
| Reduce # of hours spent in status meetings by % | 50% |
| # Of hours spent gathering updates each week | 15 |
| Weekly savings | \$1,050 |
| Monthly savings | \$4,200 |
| Yearly savings | \$50,400 |

2. No visibility into your team's workload

IT project managers today report that a lack of understanding their team's current workload and capacity is the second biggest challenge in their project management process.⁶ And with more than 80% of surveyed companies using spreadsheets to manage their work,⁷ it's not surprising we're not utilizing our teams to their true capacity.

On average, workers are spending up to 2.5 hours per day searching for and gathering information for projects and work.⁸ Among the culprits? Email. One third of project managers admit that they use a mix of email and spreadsheets as their primary project management tool.⁹

UNDERSTANDING THE PROCESS:

- When your boss asks for a status update on all of your projects, how do you find that information?
- Do you have to manually find information from each team member?
- Do you have to log in to multiple tools to access status updates?
- Are you required to present data in different formats for each stakeholder?

UNDERSTANDING THE COST:

- How many meetings do you attend each week?
- How much time do you spend in meetings each week?
- How long do you spend preparing for meetings each week?
- How many project managers are involved in each meeting?
- How many individual contributors are involved in each meeting?

EVALUATION ► PROJECT DELIVERY

Information below is based on an example of 40 projects per year with an on-time rate of 50%. This example also assumes the planned cost of a project is \$10,000, late projects total 20, and the cost of a late project is 1.5x the planned cost.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Average # of projects completed per year | 40 |
| Average project on-time rate | 50% |
| Average # late projects | 20 |
| Average planned cost of a project | \$10,000 |
| Cost of late projects (1.5X budget) | 1.5 |
| Total average cost of a late project | \$15,000 |
| Additional cost above original cost for late projects | \$5,000 |
| Yearly cost of late projects | \$100,000 |

FINDING THE RIGHT SOLUTION ► PROJECT DELIVERY

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Average # of projects completed per year | 40 |
| Reduce % of late projects by % (increase in on-time projects) | 10% |
| Average planned cost of a project | \$10,000 |
| Yearly cost of late projects | \$100,000 |
| Yearly project savings | \$10,000 |

EVALUATION ► EMAIL

Information below is based on a 30-person team with a blended rate of \$70/hour. See Appendix A.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| Average # of emails per day | 100 |
| Average # of hours in email per day | 4 |
| Average # of hours in email per week | 20 |
| Weekly cost of email | \$42,000 |
| Monthly cost of email | \$168,000 |
| Yearly cost of email | \$2,016,000 |

FINDING THE RIGHT SOLUTION ► EMAIL

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Reduce # of hours in email by % | 20% |
| Weekly savings | \$8,400 |
| Monthly savings | \$33,600 |
| Yearly savings | \$403,200 |

3. Multiple, disjointed tools

Today, the average worker uses 13 different tools or methods to manage time and work.¹⁰ The chaos of logging in and out of different platforms results in more time updating projects, exporting data to build reports, and time wasted searching for information.

In fact, the majority of project managers in the Workfront State of Project Management Survey reported that their biggest challenge in their project management process was project information scattered across too many disconnected tools.¹¹ And in a survey of middle managers, 59% agreed that they miss important data every day because information is so hard to find.¹²

UNDERSTANDING THE PROCESS:

- How many different tools do you and your team use to manage work and projects?
- Do the tools you use integrate with one another?
- If your tools don't integrate, how long does it take to go into each tool to track down project information?
- How much time do you spend building reports from data that is housed in multiple tools?
- Do you struggle with tool adoption from your team?
- What is your current process for approvals?
- What is your current process for finding project information and updates?

UNDERSTANDING THE COST:

- How much time do you spend building reports?
- How many project managers are required to build reports each week?
- How much time do you spend each week in approvals?

EVALUATION ► BUILDING REPORTS

Information below is based on an example of five team members building reports at a blended rate of \$70/hour. See Appendix A.

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Average # of hours spent building reports per week | 8 |
| Total hours spent each week building reports | 40 |
| Weekly cost of building reports | \$2,800 |
| Monthly cost of building reports | \$11,200 |
| Yearly cost of building reports | \$134,400 |

FINDING THE RIGHT SOLUTION ► BUILDING REPORTS

Information below is based on Trek Bicycles, Inc. recovering 30% of the time they previously lost to maintaining spreadsheets with increased reporting efficiency.

| | |
|--|----------|
| Percentage of time saved from increase in reporting efficiency | 30% |
| Weekly savings | \$840 |
| Monthly savings | \$3,360 |
| Yearly project savings | \$40,320 |

EVALUATION ► STREAMLINING APPROVALS

Information below is based on an example of five team members involved in approvals at a blended rate of \$70/hour. See Appendix A.

| | |
|--|----------|
| Average # of hours spent in approvals per week | 3 |
| Total hours spent each week in approvals | 15 |
| Weekly cost of approvals | \$1,050 |
| Monthly cost of approvals | \$4,200 |
| Yearly cost of approvals | \$50,400 |

FINDING THE RIGHT SOLUTION ► STREAMLINING APPROVALS

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Reduce # of hours in approvals by % | 25% |
| Weekly savings | \$263 |
| Monthly savings | \$1,050 |
| Yearly project savings | \$12,600 |

4. Requests from everywhere

The average IT organization spends between 45%–55% of their time on unplanned and urgent activities.¹³ The chaos of requests from everywhere can sideline strategic projects, tie up important resources, and create a tumultuous work environment. In fact, one in three enterprise workers attribute their work failures to a lack of clear processes and priorities.¹⁴

Among ad hoc work requests are ad hoc meetings and ad hoc conversations. More than one third of all meetings are ad hoc¹⁵ (67% of employees report that more than half of the meetings they attend are not of any value¹⁶), while 28% of the average office worker's day is spent dealing with unnecessary interruptions.¹⁷ How costly are those interruptions? Studies show it can take up to 25 minutes for employees to return to the same task they were concentrating on before an interruption, and up to 50 minutes to return to the deep concentration in which the best work is accomplished.¹⁸

UNDERSTANDING THE PROCESS:

- How do work requests come to your department or team today?
- How are work requests prioritized?
- What common interruptions do you see in your day?
- How do you prioritize fire drills that interrupt your day?

UNDERSTANDING THE COST:

- How much time do you spend on interruptions each day?
- How much time does your team spend on ad hoc work each week?
- How much time do you spend prioritizing work requests each day?

EVALUATION ► AD HOC WORK

The information below is based on the average IT team spending 45%–55% (18 hours) of their time per week on unplanned and urgent activities¹³ and is based on an example of a 30-person team with a blended rate of \$70/hour. See Appendix A.

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Average # of hours spent in ad hoc conversations, ad hoc meetings, and prioritizing ad hoc work per week | 540 |
| Weekly cost of ad hoc work | \$37,800 |
| Monthly cost of ad hoc work | \$151,200 |
| Yearly cost of ad hoc work | \$1,814,400 |

FINDING THE RIGHT SOLUTION ► AD HOC WORK

The information below is based on the average IT team spending 45%–55% (18 hours) of their time per week on unplanned and urgent activities¹³ and is based on an exam.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Reduce # of hours in approvals in hours | 4 |
| Weekly savings | \$4,200 |
| Monthly savings | \$16,800 |
| Yearly project savings | \$201,600 |

EVALUATION ► EXISTING COMMUNICATION TOOLS

The information below is based on the report that workers spend an average of 2.5 hours per day (30% of their workdays) searching for and gathering information.²⁰ This information is based on an example of a 30-person team with a blended rate of \$70/hour. See Appendix A.

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Average # of hours spent searching for project and work information | 2.5 |
| Total hours spent each week searching for project and work information | 375 |
| Weekly cost of searching for project and work information | \$26,250 |
| Monthly cost of searching for project and work information | \$105,000 |
| Yearly cost of searching for project and work information | \$1,260,000 |

5. Mixed methodologies

The multi-methodology approach to work is increasing every year. In a recent survey, 39% of project managers reported that more than 75% of their projects are completed in Waterfall while 58% reported that they work on projects that include Agile methodologies.²¹

This is positive growth between two worlds that haven't been in parallel in the past. However, there are many growing pains. A shocking 33% of project managers who mix Agile and Waterfall are using separate tools for each methodology. And 48% of project managers using separate tools to manage mixed methodologies compile their data in spreadsheets, while 19% double-enter data into two systems.²² Clearly, we still have a problem.

UNDERSTANDING THE PROCESS:

- Do you manage both Agile and traditional Waterfall (or linear) projects?
- If you manage Agile and Waterfall projects, how do you make them work together?
- How do you translate the sprints and iterations of Agile teams into the launch dates and milestones executives and other project managers need?
- Does your team create workarounds in order to get Waterfall data to project leaders and executives?

UNDERSTANDING THE COST:

- How much time do you spend translating data and jargon between Agile and Waterfall?
- How much time do you spend double-entering data into multiple tools that manage Agile and Waterfall separately?
- How many different reports do you need to build to satisfy stakeholders of your Agile projects and stakeholders of your Waterfall projects?

EVALUATION ► POOR COMMUNICATION

The following information is based on the statistic that 14% of every workweek is wasted because of poor communication.²³ If communication between Agile and Waterfall projects isn't completed in the same tool, the potential for wasted time is greater than 14%.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Average # of hours lost per poor communication per week | 5.6 |
| Total hours spent lost per poor communication per week | 168 |
| Weekly cost of poor communication | \$11,760 |
| Monthly cost of poor communication | \$47,040 |
| Yearly cost of poor communication | \$564,480 |

FINDING THE RIGHT SOLUTION ► IMPROVED COMMUNICATION

The following information is based on the potential of increased productivity (or loss of time spent communicating) of 20%–25% when social tools are used for project communication.²⁴

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Reduce # of hours searching for information by % | 35% |
| Weekly savings | \$4,116 |
| Monthly savings | \$16,464 |
| Yearly project savings | \$197,568 |

EVALUATION ► MULTIPLE TOOLS FOR MULTIPLE METHODOLOGIES

The following information is based on the data that shows the average worker uses 13 different tools to manage their work and time. Add in projects that require Agile and Waterfall communication, and project managers are responsible for double-entering data into even more tools. The following information is based on an example of half of a 30-person team with a blended rate of \$70/hour. See Appendix A..

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Average # of hours spent double-entering data | 75 |
| Weekly cost of double-entering data | \$5,250 |
| Monthly cost of double-entering data | \$21,000 |
| Yearly cost of double-entering data | \$252,000 |

FINDING THE RIGHT SOLUTION ► A SINGLE SOURCE OF TRUTH

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Reduce # of hours double-entering data by % | 90% |
| Weekly savings | \$4,725 |
| Monthly savings | \$18,900 |
| Yearly project savings | \$226,800 |

A better way: the Workfront modern work management platform.

Workfront's modern work management platform facilitates an operational system of record that unifies your entire organization. It works the way you do across every department, giving you the ability to orchestrate all of your work with better visibility and context.

Solving the biggest challenge creates visibility

Workfront solves companies' biggest challenge—disconnection that causes work chaos—through unifying tools, teams, collaboration, and processes. With a single system for all work, Workfront can provide real-time, contextual visibility across the enterprise. This visibility helps teams, managers, and executives in several ways:

ACCESS THE RIGHT DATA TO MAKE INFORMED DECISIONS

- See the big picture and align projects to strategic goals
- Plan and coordinate resources to improve commitments and outcomes
- Execute better processes and change management
- Increase collaboration and eliminate information silos
- Measure outcomes

MORE VISIBILITY MEANS MORE PRODUCTIVITY

Translating the benefits of visibility into real dollar returns means increasing productivity. Workfront is a far-reaching enterprise application platform that measurably raises productivity by:

Increasing efficiency

- Reducing waste by minimizing time spent in status meetings and email chains
- Preventing loss through greater work success rates and better time management
- Streamlining processes to increase output volumes for all types of work
- Reducing delays through improved communication and better access to data

Increasing effectiveness

- Providing trustable and contextual data to inform better decision making
- Increasing the strategic alignment of work to corporate goals
- Empowering employees with the information they need, when they need it
- Providing accurate projections of resources
- Improving the quality of outputs for all types of work

Implementing a modern work management solution addresses not only IT project management, but all work processes, increases efficiency, and provides the visibility needed to make critical strategic decisions. Better visibility, collaboration, and improved efficiency produces a quantifiable ROI for any enterprise.

Building the business case for a modern work management platform.

In today’s tough economic environment, gaining support from decision makers to fund any initiative often involves a rigorous approval process. IT managers who understand the value of a modern work management solution still need to compete for dollars with other departments, including their own. Therefore, it takes a strong business case to win funding for important initiatives like modern work management. An effective business case should include clear examples of the type of ROI expected and how it will be achieved. The benefits fall into two categories: efficiency and effectiveness. Efficiency benefits are easier to quantify because they typically result in saved time and saved money. Effectiveness benefits are less tangible and may include quality improvements and better decisions. However, both types are extremely important when evaluating the ROI of a solution.

QUANTIFYING ENTERPRISE EFFICIENCY GAINS

The following efficiency table demonstrates how to quantify the value of five key efficiency benefits of the Workfront platform. The calculations used in the table are based on an example of a 30-person team with an average blended rate of \$70/hour. See Appendix A.

| Efficiency Benefit | Before Workfront | Monthly Est. Cost | After Workfront | Monthly Est. Savings |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------|---|----------------------|
| Reduced Status Meetings | Constant meetings cut into workers’ productive and creative time. | \$42,000 | A single system of work connects collaboration with work. Result: more context and fewer meetings. | \$21,000 |
| Fewer Status Updates | Time spent updating status reports and tracking down updates cuts into real project time. | \$8,400 | A central location for all project data and quick, easy-to-build reports. Result: real-time data and less time tracking down updates. | \$4,200 |
| Increased Project Delivery | Time required to manage projects limits the number of projects that can be completed. | \$8,333 | Better visibility and work management. Result: an increase in outputs. | \$833 |
| Fewer Emails | Too many emails to read and sort through consume workers’ productivity time. | \$168,000 | Unified collaboration removes excess tools. Result: a single place for all information to reside. | \$33,600 |
| Less Time Building Reports | Too many tools leads to disconnected information and renders simple reports difficult to create, wasting precious project and work time. | \$11,200 | A single tool for all project information with built-in reporting capabilities. Result: real-time access for complete visibility. | \$3,360 |

| Efficiency Benefit | Before Workfront | Monthly Est. Cost | After Workfront | Monthly Est. Savings |
|--|--|-------------------|---|----------------------|
| Streamlined Approvals | Disjointed tools lead to multiple processes for gathering approvals, leading to delayed delivery, missed deadlines, and productive time lost gathering approvals manually. | \$4,200 | Single process for gathering approvals in the context of work. Result: faster approvals and visibility into bottlenecks. | \$1,050 |
| Reduced Ad Hoc Work | Unplanned requests, conversations, and meetings eat up precious work time and derail planned projects off schedule. | \$151,200 | A single place for all work, including unplanned requests. Result: increased visibility into the real work everyone is doing. | \$16,800 |
| Fewer Communication Tools | Misplaced project information and vital conversations recorded in multiple tools creates chaos for project managers, resulting in more time wasted searching for and gathering project communications. | \$105,000 | Introducing a social approach to communication decreases the amount of time spent searching for information. Result: more time to work and increased visibility into project communication. | \$36,750 |
| Improved Communication between Agile and Waterfall | Hours are lost in the translation of data and project requirements between Agile and Waterfall, creating a larger barrier between multiple methodologies. | \$47,040 | Automatic translation between Agile and Waterfall. Result: less time manually updating reports and sending project requirements to a separate team. | \$16,464 |
| Better Tool Management for Multiple Methodologies | Using disconnected tools for Agile and Waterfall creates double work for project managers, many spending hours and hours double-entering data between two systems to keep information up-to-date. | \$21,000 | A single source of truth removes any need to double-enter data. Result: increased visibility into multi-methodology work and more time for projects. | \$18,900 |
| Totals | | \$566,373 | | \$152,957 |

As the efficiency table indicates, it is important to consider not only the savings gained from increased efficiencies, but also factor in the cost of not correcting current work inefficiencies within the enterprise. Relying on “doing nothing” solutions or implementing a partial solution that does not address the complete end-to-end work lifecycle may be contributing to high ongoing costs. For a team of 30, work inefficiencies are estimated to cost companies \$658,040 a month or nearly \$8 million a year—significant dollars that could be better spent elsewhere.

EVALUATING ENTERPRISE EFFECTIVENESS GAINS

The following effectiveness table demonstrates how to evaluate five Workfront effectiveness benefits. While it’s more difficult to measure effectiveness gains than efficiency gains, these types of improvements provide significant business value and are crucial to any business case. The outcomes described are based on real customer experiences with the Workfront platform.

| Effectiveness Benefit | Before Workfront | After Workfront | ROI | Workfront Customer Success Story |
|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------------|--|
| Decision making | Guesswork with a tendency to repeat mistakes | Data-driven decisions based on real-time accurate information | Better business outcomes | Experienced immediate results in key areas with visibility across all work streams, not just projects. —Tampa General Hospital |
| Planning | Individual managers determine projects without evaluating strategic value | Work aligned to strategic goals | Improved business growth | Reduced the average new product development planning span from 11 months to just under three months. —InterMetro Division |
| Resource management | Overburdened or under-utilized resources | Resource requests justified based on accurate projections | Increased efficiency | Management can see who is working on what, hours being spent, and staffing needed. —American Capital |
| Employee morale | Confusion, feeling disconnected from other teams, and too many information silos | Empowered employees | Increased productivity | Helped increase on-time rate to 80% by enabling teams to get information they needed. —Trek |
| Project deliverables | Inconsistent outcomes and project deliverables | Improved quality of project deliverables | Better project outcomes | Best engineers gained 20% to 30% more time for innovating. —Trek |

As the previous table indicates, modern work management technology provides greater effectiveness across a number of areas. Its ability to provide a single source of visibility improves decision making, reduces the time and resource costs associated with managing projects, empowers employees, and provides for an overall higher level of effectiveness across the enterprise.

The global visibility offered by Workfront delivers value to every level of the enterprise. It allows:

- Senior managers to see the justification for projects and resources needed
- Managers to align projects with strategic goals and create more efficient ways for teams to work
- Enterprise workers to be more productive and creative

The benefit of managing the end-to-end work lifecycle under one system is that enterprises are able to leverage information and processes to form a unified framework for all work.

ASSESSING VALUE POTENTIAL BY SCALE

To help assess the ROI of implementing Workfront for different sized enterprises, the following value potential table provides both the monthly costs and potential savings (as illustrated in the efficiency table) and shows the total ROI that can be quickly realized by variously scaled solutions.

| Number of users | Monthly cost of workfront | Potential monthly savings | Total potential monthly roi |
|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 30 | \$1800 | \$162,124 | \$160,324 |
| 90 | \$5400 | \$486,372 | \$480,972 |
| 300 | \$18,000 | \$1,621,240 | \$1,603,240 |
| 900 | \$54,000 | \$4,863,720 | \$4,809,720 |

When building a business case for Workfront, the numbers speak for themselves. Whether the solution is scaled for a 30-member or a 1,000-member team, the enterprise begins to see an immediate return on investment in both real dollars and in less measurable but vital areas, such as more time for innovation and collaboration.

CONCLUSION

In looking for genuine solutions to project portfolio management and work management, stepping beyond point, web-based, or other traditional solutions and toward a modern work management solution means greater productivity and work success. With Workfront, improvements to pre- and post-planning, increased efficiencies, and global visibility from robust data and reporting can all be realized. With the ability to calculate the costs of doing nothing, strong ROI data, and real-world customer experiences, the business case for Workfront is compelling.

For more information visit workfront.com/it.



workfront

Orchestrate modern IT work with Workfront.

The modern enterprise demands modern solutions for managing teams, production, and digital strategy. Workfront is a modern work management platform that helps enterprises:

- Unify work, teams, and technology
- Eliminate silos
- Increase speed, productivity, and efficiency
- Rely on a single source of truth
- Work at the speed of digital

Visit us at workfront.com/it to learn more about how Workfront empowers IT teams like yours to thrive in the digital world.

Customer experiences with Workfront

Organizations incur different growing pains. Some of the challenges faced include the need for better data management, improved communication with off-site teams, and a reduction in repeatable tasks. As the following situations indicate, implementing a modern work management solution enabled these organizations to solve critical challenges, improve their workflow, and have an at-a-glance, single source of truth.



INTERMETRO

Increased compliance with NPD process from 15% to 80%, and soon 100%—Workfront has enabled InterMetro Industries to address a primary NPD challenge, which was getting multiple development teams to adopt a uniform process using a single system for tracking and reporting.

Improved visibility of capitalized R&D costs from approximately 52% to more than 95%, saving half a million dollars—With Workfront, the InterMetro Industries core team has greater visibility into where delivery bottlenecks are occurring and can now proactively address them, saving the business from potential cost overruns. Moreover, the team can better predict delivery dates and when issues might arise, preventing InterMetro Industries from running up against product delays.

Reduced the average NPD planning span from 11 months to just under three months—At InterMetro Industries, Phase 3 for NPD projects is the planning phase. During this time, project teams make critical decisions that cascade down, affecting the company's delivery process and timing.

Improved tracking of R&D labor costs from under 50% to over 90%—The successful time tracking of key developers working on NPD teams led InterMetro Industries to roll out Workfront time tracking to all development teams. The additional data is helping InterMetro Industries improve resource planning across its portfolio.

Provided support for mixed software development methodologies—The InterMetro Industries development team uses both Waterfall and Agile development methodologies. Its code repository, TFS, is integrated with Workfront because it is easier for teams to track requirements and report using the Workfront solution.



GL EDUCATION

Productivity increase of 80%—Project managers no longer waste time understanding the current status of projects or whether a problem has been solved.

Reduced monthly reporting by two days—It used to take 48 hours every month for project managers across the business to compile data and reports from Excel spreadsheets and Microsoft Project. With Workfront, detailed reports by task and project are produced instantly.

Greater trust and autonomy—Because Workfront provides an accurate, updated record of tasks and projects that is easily visible through a web browser, teams are empowered to do their work without having to continually report on their progress.

Faster project resource comparison—Before Workfront, GL Education found it difficult to both manage and compare the level of resources required across its numerous projects. Now all of that information is easy to track and view, so teams can more accurately forecast future activities.



GWA GROUP LIMITED

Increased visibility—The centralized Workfront solution provides GWA Group Limited teams with transparency into project issues, status, and priorities.

Faster decision making and issue resolution—Managers can approve documents anytime, anywhere using the online Workfront solution, which has reduced decision waiting time considerably.

Improved business case and project management discipline—Creating a consistent process for building a business case and managing projects has led to more effective project prioritization and fewer downstream supply chain issues.

More valuable meetings—Because everyone can see all of the issues in Workfront before gathering, meeting time has transitioned from status updates to strategic planning.

Appendix A

The efficiency table used a 30-person team with an average blended rate of \$70/hour. The hourly rate was figured based on the Computerworld 2012 Salary Survey²⁸ plus an additional 35% burdened rate. According to the Office of Hopkins Internal Audit at Johns Hopkins University, the average burden rate is between 30% and 40% of a worker's base salary.²⁹

| Type Of Worker | Annual Base Compensation | Hourly Rate | Burden Rate (+30%) | Burdened Rate (+35%) |
|---|--------------------------|-------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| IT/IS technology/business systems analyst | US \$78K | \$37.50 | \$48.75 | \$50.63 |
| Project leader | US \$90K | \$43 | \$58.05 | \$58.05 |
| Director IT/IS | US \$110K | \$53 | \$68.90 | \$71.55 |
| Vice president of IT/IS | US\$145K | \$70 | \$91.00 | \$94.50 |
| Average blended rate | | | \$66.68 | \$68.68 |

WORKS CITED

1. Mills, Cliff. "PM Is In Charge. National Computing Centre. May, 2009. www.ncc.co.uk.
2. Bloch, Michael, Sven Blumberg, and Jürgen Laartz. "Delivering large-scale IT projects on time, on budget, and on value." McKinsey & Company. Accessed September 12, 2018. <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/digital-mckinsey/our-insights/delivering-large-scale-it-projects-on-time-on-budget-and-on-value>
3. The State of Project Management Survey (via Workfront and projectmanagement.com)
4. Lee, Shirley. "Management / HR Statistics." Misc Management Statistics." (accessed May 28, 2014)
5. Opinion Matters, for Epsom and the Centre for Economics & Business Research May 2012
6. The State of Project Management Survey (via Workfront and projectmanagement.com)
7. The State of Project Management Survey (via Workfront and projectmanagement.com)
8. Feldman, Jonathan. "Project Management Is Finally Getting Real Respect." InformationWeek. <http://www.informationweek.com/team-building-and-staffing/project-management-is-finally-getting-real-respect/d/d-id/1093342> (accessed May 28, 2014).
9. Jones, Jeanette. "Various Survey Statistics: Workers Spend Too Much Time Searching for Information." Cottrill Research RSS 092. <http://cottrillresearch.com/various-survey-statistics-workers-spend-too-much-time-searching-for-information/> (accessed May 28, 2014).
10. The State of Project Management Survey (via Workfront and projectmanagement.com)
11. <http://www.shirleyfinelee.com/MgmtStats>
12. The State of Project Management Survey (via Workfront and projectmanagement.com)
13. Accenture, Wall Street Journal, 5/14/2007
14. The Institute of Internal Auditors. "Change and Patch Management Controls: Critical for Organizational Success." Global Technology Audit Guide. 2005. <http://www.aicpa.org/InterestAreas/InformationTechnology/Resources/ITAssuranceServices/Guidance/DownloadableDocuments/GTAG2PatchMgmtControls.pdf>.
15. "The State of Work Report: 2018-2019 U.S. Edition." Workfront. 2018.
16. "Collaboration 2.0: Death of the Web Conference (As We Know It)," Ovum Consulting. London, United Kingdom.
17. "Collaboration 2.0: Death of the Web Conference (As We Know It)," Ovum Consulting. London, United Kingdom.
18. Spira, Jonathon, "The Cost of Not Paying Attention: How Interruptions Impact Knowledge Workers Productivity," Basex, accessed August 20, 2014. <http://iorgforum.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/CostOfNotPayingAttention.BasexReport.pdf>.
19. "Excuse me? The Cost of Workplace Interruptions." Wall Street Journal video, 5:58, Sept. 10, 2013, <http://live.wsj.com/video/excuse-me-the-cost-of-workplace-interruptions/9B110C16-2D76-43B0-AB71-2B20F31ADBA1.html#!9B110C16-2D76-43B0-AB71-2B20F31ADBA1>.
20. "Change and Patch Management Controls."
21. Jones, Jeanette. "Various Survey Statistics: Workers Spend Too Much Time Searching for Information." Cottrill Research RSS 092. <http://cottrillresearch.com/various-survey-statistics-workers-spend-too-much-time-searching-for-information/> (accessed May 28, 2014).
22. "The Social Economy: Unlocking Value and Productivity Through Social Technologies," McKinsey & Company, July 2012.
23. State of Project Management Survey
24. Easen, Nick. "Promoting Plain Workplace English." CNN.com, 6 May 2004.
25. "The Social Economy: Unlocking Value and Productivity Through Social Technologies," McKinsey & Company, July 2012.
26. "Salary Survey 2012." Computerworld. <http://www.computerworld.com/category/salarysurvey2012>.
27. "Labor Burden: An Audit Primer". The Office of Hopkins Internal Audit. John Hopkins University. <http://www.jhu.edu/ohia/burden.html>.



workfront[®]