|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Close-Out Report | |
| **Report Date: 27/03/2024** | |
| **Key Information** | |
| Project Name | *AHI App Development (Acme Health Innovations)* |
| Division/Department | Team\_6\_PNK |
| Project Sponsor | Phenikaa University |
| Project Manager | Cary Manning |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Goals** |
| Document the original goals from the project charter. |
| 1. A major provider of advanced skin care products |
| 1. develop an application (app) that provides real-time marketing data to address marketing shortfalls |
| 1. Improve customer satisfaction |
| 1. Establish marketing strategies |
| 1. Achieve financial targets |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Goal Success Analysis** |
| Highlight the success or failure in meeting the project goals from the original plan and explain deviations. (Success, Partial Success, Not Accomplished) |
| 1. The primary goal of this project is to research, design, and develop advanced skin care products that will provide significant benefits to our customers.  2. The project aims to meet the evolving needs of our customers by offering high-quality, effective skin care solutions that address various skin concerns.  3. Develop comprehensive marketing strategies to effectively promote and distribute the new skin care products, ensuring maximum market penetration and customer reach.  4. The project aims to generate a positive return on investment by successfully launching and selling the developed skin care products. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Scope Review** |
| Call out any variances to the original scope plan and briefly describe why they happened. Can these variances be prevented in future projects? If so, how? |
| Product Range Expansion:   1. Variance: The original scope plan outlined the development of a specific set of skin care products. However, during the project execution, additional product variants were introduced to cater to diverse customer needs. 2. Reason: Customer feedback, market research, and emerging trends necessitated the expansion of the product range to address a broader range of skin concerns and preferences.   Extended Regulatory Compliance Activities:   1. Variance: The timeline for regulatory compliance activities extended beyond the initially estimated duration. 2. Reason: Stringent regulatory requirements, unexpected regulatory changes, and delays in obtaining approvals contributed to the extension of compliance activities.   Production Process Optimization Challenges:   1. Variance: Challenges arose during the optimization of production processes, leading to delays in achieving desired efficiency targets. 2. Reason: Complexities in integrating new technologies, training personnel, and addressing unforeseen technical issues prolonged the optimization process.   Scope Expansion Due to Stakeholder Input:   1. Variance: Scope expanded to accommodate additional features and requirements based on stakeholder input received during the project execution. 2. Reason: Stakeholders provided valuable insights and suggestions that were deemed essential for enhancing product effectiveness and market competitiveness.   Market Strategy Adjustments:   1. Variance: Adjustments were made to the original marketing strategies based on market dynamics and competitor actions. 2. Reason: Market conditions, consumer behavior, and competitor activities evolved during the project timeline, necessitating agile adjustments to marketing strategies. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Schedule Review** |
| Call out any variances to the original schedule plan and briefly describe why they happened. Can these variances be prevented in future projects? If so, how? |
| Regulatory Approval Delays:   1. Variance: The timeline for obtaining regulatory approvals extended beyond the originally estimated duration. 2. Reason: Regulatory agencies may have had increased workload, stringent requirements, or unexpected procedural delays, impacting the approval timeline.   Production Process Optimization Challenges:   1. Variance: Challenges in optimizing production processes led to delays in achieving desired efficiency targets. 2. Reason: Technical complexities, unexpected issues during implementation, and the need for additional training or resources may have contributed to delays in process optimization.   Scope Creep Impacting Timeline:   1. Variance: Scope creep occurred as additional features or requirements were added to the project scope, impacting the original timeline. 2. Reason: Stakeholder input, emerging market trends, or evolving customer needs may have led to scope expansion during the project execution phase.   Market Strategy Adjustments:   1. Variance: Adjustments to marketing strategies were made during the project execution phase, impacting the original schedule. 2. Reason: Changes in market dynamics, competitor actions, or consumer behavior may have necessitated agile adjustments to marketing plans to maintain competitiveness.  * By developing strengths based on differences, future projects can minimize variances from the original budget plan and enhance overall project success by effectively managing costs and responding to changing circumstances in a proactive manner. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Cost Review** |
| Call out any variances to the original budget plan over or under and briefly describe why they happened. Can these variances be prevented in future projects? If so, how? |
| Overall, the project went over the original budget plan. Key factors:   1. Product range expansion increased material and production costs. 2. Extended regulatory compliance activities raised consulting fees. 3. Addressing production optimization challenges required additional capital investment in equipment and training. 4. Scope expansions from stakeholder inputs added unplanned costs. 5. Marketing adjustments incurred extra expenses for new campaigns.   To prevent major cost overruns, more comprehensive planning, stringent scope control, risk mitigation, and flexible budgeting is recommended. Early identifier of potential variances is also crucial. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Risk Analysis** |
| Call out anticipated or unanticipated risks that impacted the project. Could these risks be prevented in future similar projects? If so, how? Refer to the Risk Register to review or link to register directly. |
| Anticipated risks that materialized:   1. Regulatory delays 2. Production process optimization challenges 3. Scope creep from added requirements   Unanticipated risks:   1. Supply chain disruptions impacting material availability 2. Skilled labor shortages delaying production ramp-up 3. Competitive product launches shifting market dynamics   Risk mitigation strategies for future projects:   1. Comprehensive risk identification and contingency planning 2. Supply chain diversification and maintenance of buffer inventory 3. Partnerships with educational institutions for workforce development 4. Dedicated competitive intelligence and market monitoring capabilities |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Outstanding Items** | | |
| List any outstanding project-related follow-up items, how they are being addressed, and who is responsible. | | |
| **Issue** | **Planned Resolution** | **Assigned To** |
| Post Launch product support and customer service | Establish dedicated support team | Customer Service Manager |
| Manufacturing quanlity audits third-party audits | Schedule periodic | Quality |
| Online marketing Implement SEO | List any outstanding project-related follow-up items | All member of teams |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Lessons Learned** | |
| **DID WELL**  Note what aspects of the project went well or better than expected, and share your thoughts on how this positive outcome could be replicated in future projects. | |
| **ITEM** | **NOTES** |
| Agile Execution | Adopting agile methodologies allowed the team to nimbly adapt to changing needs. |
|  | Accelerate time-to-market for MVP releases. |
| Stakeholder Engagement | Consistent engagement with key stakeholders throughout gathered valuable inputs that enhanced product quality and market fit. |
|  |  |
| **DO BETTER**  Note what aspects of the project went poorly or worse than expected, and share your thoughts on how this less than desirable outcome could be avoided in future projects. | |
| **ITEM** | **NOTES** |
| Requirements Definition | More rigorous requirements gathering |
|  | Validation upfront could have prevented significant scope creep late in the project. |
| Risk Mitigation | Risks like supply chain and labor issues were not adequately anticipated - invest in more comprehensive risk identification. |
|  |  |
| **Recommendations** | |
| Note any recommendations for future project managers managing similar projects. | |
| Enhance market intelligence capabilities  Develop strategic partnerships/alliances  Invest in production flexibility/scalability | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Archives** |
| Note where those wanting to reference documents related to this project in the future will be able to find them. |
| All project documentation, including reports, plans, communication records and other artifacts have been uploaded to the centralized AHI Project Repository at:  <https://github.com/nguyencong1227/Capstone-Project-Scenario-Phenikaa> |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Closeout** |
| * Lessons Learned Conducted: 01/03/2024 * Closeout Review Complete: 27/03/2024 |