

# LESSONS LEARNED LOG

Template T-25 · Chapter 16: Project Closure · radimkaufmann.com

Project	PM / Facilitator	Session Date
---------	------------------	--------------

Type: Positive = what worked well (repeat this) · Negative = what went wrong (avoid this) · Suggestion = improvement idea | Status: Draft · Reviewed · Approved · Shared to Knowledge Base

LL-ID	Date	Phase	Category	Type	What Happened (Situation)	Root Cause / Why It Happened	Impact	Recommendation for Future Projects	Owner
LL-001	17/03/26	Initiation	Stakeholder	Negative	IT Head not included in initial stakeholder mapping — discovered resistance only at infrastructure provisioning stage	Stakeholder analysis (T-04) was completed too quickly without input from all department heads	High — 2-week delay in infrastructure readiness	Always include all department heads in initial stakeholder mapping. Conduct a stakeholder interview round before finalising T-04	PM
LL-002	17/03/26	Planning	Scope	Negative	Requirements document required 3 revision cycles before customer sign-off — planned for 1	Requirements workshop was held once; customer stakeholders were not all present	Medium — 2-week planning delay	Hold requirements workshops in at least 2 rounds. Confirm all decision-makers are present before the first session. Always run a 1-week technical spike for any third-party integration before committing to estimates. Include Architect in bid/no-bid assessment	BA
LL-003	17/03/26	Execution	Technical	Negative	ERP API integration was more complex than estimated — caused a 3-week schedule impact	Integration complexity was assessed based on vendor documentation only, without a technical spike	High — 3-week delay + €12,000 additional	Include Architect in bid/no-bid assessment	Architect
LL-004	17/03/26	Execution	Vendor	Negative	Vendor missed contracted delivery date by 3 weeks without early warning	Vendor reporting was monthly; no early warning mechanism in place	High — cascading impact on UAT and acceptance	Include weekly vendor check-ins from Week 4 of execution. Add contractual milestone reporting obligation to all vendor contracts.	PM
LL-005	17/03/26	Planning	Risk	Positive	Pre-mortem workshop (T-17) in Week 3 of planning surfaced 4 risks that were not on the initial risk register	Structured facilitation allowed team members to voice concerns they had not raised informally	Positive — risks mitigated before execution	Run pre-mortem workshop as standard practice at the end of planning for all Category C and D projects.	PM
LL-006	17/03/26	Execution	Team	Positive	Daily stand-ups during execution phase improved issue resolution speed significantly	Short daily format forced issues to be surfaced same-day rather than waiting for weekly status meeting	Positive — average issue resolution time reduced from 4 days	Maintain daily stand-ups during execution phases of all projects. 15 minutes maximum. Use T-19 action items as input.	PM
LL-007	17/03/26	Monitoring	Communication	Suggestion	Customer felt uninformed between bi-weekly calls — contacted PM directly by phone multiple times	Communication matrix did not include a customer-facing status dashboard	delivery impact but customer satisfaction	Add a read-only live dashboard or SharePoint status page for the customer in all future projects. Update weekly.	PM
LL-008	17/03/26	Planning	Schedule	Negative	Buffer time was not built into the UAT phase — any vendor delay cascaded directly to acceptance	Schedule was optimistic; dependencies between vendor delivery and UAT start were not adequately buffered	High — UAT compressed from 3 weeks to 10 days	Always add minimum 20% buffer to phases that depend on external deliveries. Model best/worst case scenarios in Gantt (T-07)	PM
LL-009	17/03/26	Closure	Process	Positive	Structured handover checklist (T-22 Delivery Report) prevented two missing documentation items from slipping through at PAC	Checklist forced systematic review of all handover items before acceptance meeting	Positive — acceptance completed without rework	Use T-22 Delivery Report for all milestone deliveries, not only final acceptance. Adapt Section 7 for each delivery type.	QA Lead

LL-010	17/03/26	Execution	Budget	Suggestion	Budget tracking was manual (Excel); actual vs. planned comparison required significant PM effort each week	No integration between time sheets (T-08) and budget template (T-10)	Low — 2-3 hours/week PM overhead	invest in project management tool (MS Project, Smartsheet, or equivalent) for projects >6 months. Link time tracking to budget automatically.	PMO
LL-011	17/03/26	Planning	Team	Positive	Competency matrix (T-14) identified QA skill gap before execution — training was arranged proactively	Gap identified in planning phase; 2-week training completed before testing phase started	testing quality improved; no defects attributable to	Run T-14 Competency Matrix assessment at project start for all execution team members. Use results to drive training plan. Add risk review as standing agenda item in weekly status meeting (T-19). Make T-15 update a gate criterion for weekly report (T-20).	PM
LL-012	17/03/26	Execution	Risk	Suggestion	Risk register (T-15) was not reviewed weekly as planned — fell to bi-weekly	Risk review depended on PM initiative; no calendar reminder or governance enforcement	Low — two risks escalated without early warning		PM

## LESSONS LEARNED SUMMARY

Total	12	Positive	4	Negative	5	Suggestions	3	Approved	9
-------	----	----------	---	----------	---	-------------	---	----------	---

From "Project Management: From Initiation to Closure" by Radim Kaufmann · [radimkaufmann.com](http://radimkaufmann.com) · Free download · Capture lessons throughout the project, not only at closure

Status
Approved
Approved
Approved
Approved
Approved
Approved
Reviewed
Approved
Approved

Draft
Approved
Reviewed