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Introduction to LANL’s Enterprise Project

- Project objective was implementation of COTS Enterprise Resource Planning system to replace antiquated, home-grown HR, Finance, Procurement, and Project Management business systems
  - Launched in 2001
  - Determined to have “no chance of success” with existing project structure – which lacked both systems engineers and qualified project managers – in 2003
  - Reconstituted in 2004 with both project management and distributed systems engineering functions
  - Issued first “release” in October, 2004
  - Formally closed in 2006, with additional functionality released as part of the routine operation of the IT Department
Introduction Continued – Project Organization

- **Project Director**
  - Deputy for Implementation
    - Technical Team
  - Deputy for Project Management
    - Functional Teams
  - Deputy for Change Management
    - Transition Teams

Applied the enterprise technology
Owned functional requirements, architectural design, configuration management, integration, verification

Responsible for acceptance and use of the system
Owned specialty engineering – human factors/organizational development; process engineering/reengineering; procedures development; training; transition to production; sustainment
Orientation to this Presentation

• Focus of this talk is on the Enterprise Project’s implementation of two key elements of the stakeholder requirements definition process – stakeholder identification and requirements elicitation – with a discussion of what worked and what didn’t (and our thoughts as to why)

• Results were obtained through lessons learned exercises conducted by the project team after each release
  ▪ In the future, we should do XYZ again because doing XYZ contributed to the following positive outcome:________
  ▪ In the future, we should not do ABC again because doing ABC resulted in the following negative outcome:________
Approach to Identification of Stakeholders

• Defined stakeholders as those individuals or groups who would be affected, directly or indirectly, by the project.

• Defined classes of stakeholders as identified in the change management literature: sponsors, advocates, change agents, and end users.

• Used the project’s WBS to identify individual stakeholders and/or stakeholder organizations for each category, asking the question at each WBS element “Who is affected by this element?”
  ▪ End users were generally all members of a few organizational entities, so were identified on an organizational, rather than an individual, basis.
  ▪ Used members of the functional teams as surrogates for members of their business application units.

Initial lists of stakeholders were validated and periodically reviewed.
Stakeholder ID Lessons Learned

• Most stakeholder ID approaches were only partially successful – resulted in some stakeholders being omitted or underestimated
  ▪ Use of the WBS
  ▪ Use of the stakeholder classes defined in the change management literature
  ▪ Use of stakeholder representatives and surrogates

• Validation/review processes failed to identify omissions timely enough

• In the future, we would:
  ▪ Augment WBS-based stakeholder ID with ID based on system lifecycle
  ▪ Broaden the classes of stakeholders considered to include system critic, system adversary, and system threat
  ▪ Validate with surrogates what stakeholders they represent, and ensure that all stakeholders really are represented
Approach to Requirements Derivation

- Highest level requirement was the transition of the system from development to acceptance and use in the operational environment
  - This perspective focused the requirements elicitation on the transition, that is, the processes that people go through to adapt to new situations (Bridges 2003)
  - Sought to understand the activities and artifacts that would be needed to move the stakeholders from a state of commitment to legacy systems to a state of acceptance and adoption of the ERP system
  - Identified requirements relative to each stage of the transition process
Use of the Transition Process Lifecycle

Kubler-Ross’s (1969) Coping Stages

- **Denial**: Disbelief, feels reality is unacceptable.
- **Immobilization**: Shock, confusion, mental paralysis.
- **Anger**: Effort to regain control.
- **Bargaining**: Effort to regain control or “retake the ship.” Trying to minimize impact.
- **Testing**: Beginning to try new alternatives.
- **Depression**: Frustration, sense of loss, low productivity/quality of work.
- **Acceptance**: Support of the change with possible willingness to help others through the transition.

Awareness-to-Commitment Curve

- **Awareness**
- **Understanding**
- **Acceptance**
- **Commitment**

Ownership

Timeline
Use of Resistance to Change Factors

- Used Connor’s (1995) resistance to change factors as a diagnostic to understand how different stakeholders would experience the different factors and to inform selection of interventions
  - Some reasons for resistance: lack of trust; belief that change is unnecessary or not feasible; economic threats; relative high cost; fear of personal failure; loss of status and power; threat to values and ideals; and resentment of interference
Use of Burke’s Model

• Mapped Burke’s (1993) model to the Awareness-to-Commitment curve and used it, as well as work by Kanter, Stein, and Jick (1992), to suggest transition activities and artifacts
  - Four stages of change – pre-launch, launch, post-launch, and sustaining – roughly correspond to the stages represented on the Awareness-to-Commitment curve
    - Addressing resistance to change occurs during the post-launch phase
  - Examples of particular products that were specified: communications materials and branding; business process descriptions, process flows, and procedures; descriptions of roles and responsibilities and associated staffing profiles; training materials; demonstrations, simulations, and “day-in-the-life” descriptions; and requirements traceability matrices to support transition to operations
# A Framework for Managing Change (adapted from Burke 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Change</th>
<th>Pre-launch</th>
<th>Launch</th>
<th>Post-launch</th>
<th>Sustaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desired Outcome</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Requirements Definition Lessons Learned (1)

- Things to repeat in the future
  - Use Connor’s resistance to change factors as a diagnostic
    - Helped us to understand the requirements for various interventions
  - Use the combination of the Awareness-to-Commitment Curve and Burke’s (1993) model to understand timing requirements for transition activities
    - Helped us to understand the need for early intervention
Requirements Definition Lessons Learned (2)

• Things to change in the future
  ▪ Dependence on the Awareness-to-Commitment Curve contributed to a failure to recognize the life cycle linkages between the legacy system and the ERP and to miss the opportunity to facilitate “letting go” of the old system
    – Incorporate the system dynamics associated with successive generations into the Awareness-to-Commitment Curve (interlocking S curves)
  ▪ “Academic” approach was not adequately tested for fit with organizational dynamics, resulting in unintended consequences that increased resistance to the change
    – Use the literature as a source of ideas, but always evaluate the concepts in the operational environment prior to use
Project Organization Lessons Learned

- Distributing the systems engineering functions across the Implementation and Change Management teams resulted in disconnects in requirements.

- In the future, organize as follows:

  - Project Director
  - Deputy for Project Management
  - Deputy for Systems Engineering
  - Deputy for Implementation
  - Deputy for Technical Realization Teams
  - Deputy for Functional Realization Teams
  - Deputy for Requirements Team
  - Deputy for Testing & V&V Team
  - Deputy for Transition Teams
Conclusions

- System engineering practices can be informed and enriched by learning from other domains, including the discipline of change management
  - The adaptation of Kubler-Ross’s (1969) coping strategy model to a transition lifecycle and the use of Connor’s (1995) change resistance factors as a diagnostic were particularly helpful

- Adherence to systems engineering’s most fundamental principles – that all stakeholder requirements must be systematically elicited, analyzed and prioritized, verified and validated, and tracked and maintained throughout the project lifecycle – is key to project success

- Skyrme’s (1999) assertion about project failures being the result of inadequate attention to stakeholder concerns, rather than to failures of technology, was borne out
  - Unrecognized, and therefore, unmet stakeholder requirements accounted for many of the difficulties encountered on the Enterprise Project
References


*Copyrighted material, used by permission under the INCOSE member use clause which states “Permission to reproduce this document and use this document or parts thereof by members of INCOSE and to prepare derivative works from this document is granted, with attribution to INCOSE and the original author(s) where practical, provided this copyright notice is included with all reproductions and derivative works.”*