

PROJECT POST-MORTEM

Project Title: Ryan's Backyard Deck Project

Date Prepared: 09/06/2025

Project Overview:

Ryan's Backyard Deck Project aimed to build a durable and visually appealing 12x16-foot backyard deck. The primary goals were to enhance outdoor living space, increase property value, and provide a comfortable area for family leisure. The project was considered successful if the deck was completed by March 30, 2025, within the \$10,000 budget, and met safety and quality standards. The project was completed slightly behind schedule (by one week) and over budget by approximately \$1,200 due to supplier delays and material quality issues. Despite these setbacks, the finished deck met quality and functional requirements, and stakeholders were satisfied.

Key Accomplishments:

- **Quality Outcome:** The deck was structurally sound, met safety standards, and provided the intended family space.
- **Stakeholder Satisfaction:** Client and sponsor were satisfied with the final product.
- **Risk Mitigation:** Weather delays were managed effectively by rescheduling work during fair conditions.
- **Team Coordination:** Project team (carpenter, mason, general labor) communicated well and adapted to changes quickly.

Key Problem Areas:

- **Supplier Issues:** A lumber delivery was delayed by five days, causing a ripple effect in the schedule.
- **Material Quality:** Some wood planks were warped, requiring reordering and contributing to the budget overrun.
- **Budget Overrun:** Final costs reached \$11,200 due to replacement materials and increased labor hours.
- **Permit Processing:** Local permitting took longer than expected, delaying the foundation work by three days.

Post Project Tasks/Future Considerations

- Apply sealant annually to preserve the deck's durability.
- Install additional lighting (future upgrade).
- Conduct stakeholder review to evaluate long-term satisfaction after six months.
- Update vendor list to avoid repeat supplier issues.

PROJECT POST-MORTEM

Lessons Learned:

| Category | Lesson Learned | Achieved? | Comments |
|-------------------|--|-----------|---|
| Project Planning | Product concept was appropriate to Business Objectives | Yes | Deck aligned with goals to improve outdoor living space and property value. |
| | Project Plan and Schedule were well-documented, with appropriate structure and detail | Partially | Initial schedule was clear but underestimated permitting and supplier lead times. |
| | Project Schedule encompassed all aspects of the project | No | Did not fully account for buffer time for permit approval or supplier delays |
| | Tasks were defined adequately | Yes | Major tasks(foundation, framing, railing, finishing) were broken down properly |
| | Stakeholders (e.g., Sponsor, Customer) had appropriate input into the project planning process | Yes | Sponsor and client input helped finalize design scope |
| | Requirements were gathered to sufficient detail | Yes | Functional requirements (size, material, safety compliance) were captured |
| | Requirements were documented clearly | Yes | Requirements documented in the charter and design notes |
| | Specifications were clear and well-documented | Partially | Material specs documented, but vendor quality standards were not enforced well enough |
| | Test Plan was adequate, understandable, and well-documented | N/A | No formal test plan. Visual and safety inspection served as acceptance criteria. |
| | External dependencies were identified, agreements signed | Partially | Permits identified, but supplier reliability underestimated |
| | Project budget was well defined | Partially | Baseline budget was defined, but contingency was too low |
| | End of Phase Criteria were clear for all project phases | Yes | Milestones (framing, railing, finishing) were clearly set |
| | Project Plan had buy-in from the stakeholders | Yes | Stakeholders approved project scope and schedule |
| | Stakeholders had easy access to Project Plan and Schedule | Yes | Plan shared via progress updates and weekly meetings |
| Project Execution | Project stuck to its original goals | Yes | Despite delays, scope remained consistent (deck only, no scope creep) |
| | Changes in direction that did occur were of manageable frequency and magnitude | Yes | Minor adjustments made for material replacement only |
| | Project baselines (Scope, Time, Cost, Quality) were well-managed (e.g., changed through a formal Change Control Process) | Partially | Scope and quality maintained, but cost and schedule variances occurred |
| | Design changes were well-controlled | Yes | All design requests reviewed and approved before implementation |
| | Basic project management processes (e.g., Risk Management, Issue Management) were adequate | Yes | Issues tracked (supplier, weather) and responses documented |
| | Project tracked progress against baselines and reported accurate status | Yes | Weekly reports showed variances clearly |
| | Procurement (e.g., RFP, Contract with vendor) went smoothly | No | Supplier delays and warped materials caused issues |

PROJECT POST-MORTEM

| Category | Lesson Learned | Achieved? | Comments |
|---------------|---|-----------|---|
| | Contracted vendor provided acceptable deliverables of appropriate quality, on time, and within budget | No | Some materials were defective and late, leading to budget overrun |
| | Stakeholders were satisfied with the information they received | Yes | Sponsor and client received timely updates |
| | The project had adequate Quality Control | Yes | Inspections ensured deck met safety and quality standards |
| | Requirements – specifications – Test Plan were well-managed (e.g., Requirements Management System was used) | Partially | Functional requirements tracked, but no formal test plan beyond inspections |
| Human Factors | Project Manager reported to the appropriate part of the organization | Yes | PM aligned with sponsor and client throughout |
| | Project Manager was effective | Yes | Managed delays and issues effectively despite setbacks |
| | Project Team was properly organized and staffed | Yes | Carpenter, mason, and general labor were assigned appropriately |
| | Project Manager and staff received adequate training | N/A | Training not needed for experienced team |
| | Project Team's talent and experience were adequate | Yes | Skilled trades completed work successfully |
| | Project team worked effectively on project goals | Yes | Adjusted schedule and tasks to stay on track |
| | Project team worked effectively with outside entities | Partially | Managed contractor well, but supplier relationship was problematic |
| | There was good communication within the Project Team | Yes | Weekly check-ins supported coordination |
| | Management gave this project adequate attention and time | Yes | Sponsor was involved and supportive |
| | Resources were not over-committed | Yes | Team availability was sufficient |
| | Resources were consistently committed to project aims | Yes | Labor team remained engaged throughout |
| | Functional areas cooperated well | Yes | Carpenter and mason collaborated effectively |
| | Conflicting departmental goals did not cause problems | Yes | Small project with aligned stakeholders |
| | Authority and accountability were well defined and public | Yes | PM retained authority, decisions approved by sponsor |
| Overall | Initial cost and schedule estimates were accurate | No | Underestimated contingency, project ran over budget and by one week |
| | Product was delivered within amended schedule | Yes | Completed one week late, but within revised timeline |
| | Product was delivered within amended budget | No | \$1,200 overrun due to rework and supplier delays |
| | Overall Change Control was effective | Yes | All scope and budget changes documented and approved |
| | External dependencies were understood and well-managed | Partially | Permitting delays and supplier reliability not fully controlled |
| | Technology chosen was appropriate | Yes | Materials and tools suitable for requirements |
| | The project was a technological success | Yes | Deck built to code, safe, and durable |
| | Customer's needs/requirements were met | Yes | Deck provided functional outdoor spaces as intended |
| | Customer was satisfied with the product | Yes | Client approved the final deliverable |
| | Project Objectives were met | Yes | Functional, safe, and aesthetic deck delivered |
| | Business Objectives were met | Yes | Increased property value and outdoor usability |

PROJECT POST-MORTEM

PROJECT POST-MORTEM

Project Close Acceptance:

Charlotte Josephine

Project Manager Signature

Emilie Doris

Sponsor Signature

Charlotte Josephine

Project Manager Name

Emilie Doris

Sponsor Name

9/06/2025

Date

9/06/2025

Date