|  |
| --- |
| INTRODUCTION |
| *The Guideline and Template Content Starts on the Following Page*  *Delete guidelines before final submission of document*  *THIS DOCUMENT IS LIMITED TO 4 PAGES IN LENGTH*  What This Is  Templates for creating a brief description of a new project idea, typically used as input to a project portfolio planning process. The goal is to not only capture good ideas for new projects, but also to provide a crisp and consistent format that allows new project ideas to be rapidly and systematically compared with projects already in the start queue or in operation.  Several examples are included to show how a proposal form can be used in the early days of a new project idea. Some proposals are used to get new ideas into consideration as potential projects, even when only the idea and sketchy idea of its potential return is known. Other more detailed proposals go further to include detailed business justification information and first estimates of costs and benefits, so that Executive Management can make decisions about whether to fund the project and when. Examples of both are included.  Why It’s Useful  An NPP form, often with related rough business case information, lays out the idea for a new project in a quickly digestible form. It provides a sanity check of the project idea – how important is it to the customer and the company – and provides a consistent format for quick evaluation, comparison, and decision-making by senior management on a large number of project proposals. Having a process for submitting these ideas also helps make sure that “stealth” projects aren't sapping your resources. (Do you really know what people are working on?)  How to Use It   1. Encourage anyone to submit new project ideas using a proposal form. 2. Document any quantitative business justification in the document or in a short, rough business case to go along with the New Project Proposal page. Clearly label assumptions and “guesstimates.” A company typically specifies how much business case information should be submitted with the original proposal. Some detail, especially even rough financial estimates, may not be present in the first proposal version. 3. Feed the proposals into a company system for logging and reviewing new project ideas. The pipeline of new ideas should be reviewed on a regular basis. 4. For each new idea submitted via NPP, management/ marketing should decide whether to  * **Investigate the idea further now:** e.g. develop further business case information and rough ideas of project feasibility and scope, before making a decision. This decision would typically launch the “Concept” or “Initiation” phase of a new project. Some companies label this “phase 0.” * **Kill the idea outright.** * **Or put the idea on hold, to investigate later**.  1. An NPP should get additional investigation as a potential project only if the reviewers of the NPP deem it important enough. (Remember, we’re trying to keep from having people scattered across too many project efforts. The NPP review process helps make sure that even at the concept stage, only the most important ideas take up time from scarce resources.) 2. After an NPP has received further investigation and the new data reviewed, a team may be appointed to take the concept on into a full project. |

The Guideline and Template Content Starts on the Following Page

This format for a project proposal can also be used to launch a new idea into the company’s project pipeline. This format is used in companies who ask teams to iterative create such information during the early and short “concept” or “initiation” phase of a project (sometimes referred to as Phase 0).

The originator of the idea would simply fill out as much information as they have and obviously many fields would still be blank in the first version. Then if the executive decision-makers approve further investigative work on this idea, the proposal document would get updated during “phase 0” until the project idea was fleshed out. For some companies this becomes the “scope statement” of the project. The executives would make a decision as to whether the project should be funded further to proceed on to the planning phase.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROJECT NAME:** |  | | |
| **Project type:** |  | **Proposal Rev and Date:** |  |
| **Project Sponsor:** |  | **Project Manager:** |  |
| **Target Completion:** |  | **Total Budget Est:** |  |
| **Project Overview:** | | | |
| **Project Objectives Statement:**  *Succinct statement expressing the bottom line goals including key parameters in area of time, scope, resources/cost, e.g. “The goal of this project is to deliver xxxx to market in yyyy form no later than [date], working with [partner1, partner2….]. Problem to be solved, service or product to be offered, cost reduction to be made, etc.* | | | |
| **Business Justification:** Why should our company do it now? How does it align with our strategy? What is the perceived impact if we don’t do it now?  **Should this project’s schedule be accelerated? Why?** (e.g. to meet a market window, to respond to or beat competition, to achieve a desired ROI, etc.)? | | | |
| **Key Stakeholders:** Identify the major people, groups, entities that are / will in the future have an interest in the project | | | |
| **Related Projects:** Known dependencies with other projects: | | | |
| **Technology: What's involved? What technology risks?** | | | |
| **Major Risks:** list the top 5 risks | | | |
| **Questions/items for further research before a full project would be approved and funded:** | | | |
| **Project Scope** | | | |
| **In Scope:** | | | |
| **Out of Scope:** | | | |
| **Deliverables:** | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Early Staffing Estimates** | | |
| **Resources needed to investigate before project approval:** *Identify resources that would be needed to investigate possible solutions, including estimated level of effort, duration, and expenditures – for the investigation Management needs before fully funding the project.*  **Resources Needed for Full Project (estimate):**  *Specialized resources that would be required (technical, management, etc.):* | | | |
| **FUNCTION:** | | **Skill level, specific experience, etc.** | **FTE** |
| **Functional group 1** | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |
| **Functional group 2** | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |
| **etc** | |  |  |

*“Function” means the various functional groups needed on the project (e.g. marketing, sales, development, process experts, networking engineers, architects, etc.)*

*“FTE” stands for “full time equivalent,” or the approximate number of man-hours divided by 8 hours per day. Gives managers an understanding of how many people from each function may be required.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rough Project Timeline \*\*** | | | | | |
| **Phase:** | **0 – Proposal** | **1 –** | **2 –** | **3 –** | **4 –** |
| **Review Date:** |  | TBD | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| **Range:** |  |  |  |  |  |

*\*\* As a small group does investigative work on alternatives, it should identify how a project timeline could play out – how the project would likely be broken down into phases, and of what rough duration. An early take at such a timeline during phase 0, before the idea is even approved, helps Management understand how the project would fit into the existing portfolio and resource allocation. The ‘range’ row is thus used to show uncertainty on the phase end dates. The proposal document can be updated all the way through the investigation/planning phase, until a full project plan and schedule exist, at which point these phase-end-dates would become solid.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Related DocumentsExecutive Decision Record** | | | |
| **Topic** | **Description** | **Ref / Link/Attachment** |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Executive Decision Record** | | |
| **Date** | **Approver** | **Decision Made**  (resource assignments, project funding, scope decisions, etc.) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

*The team can include a decision record to note critical decisions made regarding the project definition as well as decisions on whether to proceed with further work after each review.*