**Reflection**

**Overarching Question**:  Describe the Change Enablement / Management practice, stating its potential benefits and pitfalls for an organization. You may also draw insights from the case study discussion but refrain from copying answers provided.

The Change Enablement Practice is all about maximizing the number of successful service and product changes. This is achieved by properly assessing risks that come with such change before authorizing its deployment, and then managing the schedule of when to implement change in the organization.

Benefits:

A big benefit of the practice is in allowing a business to be responsive to change.

It brings value to customers by meeting agreed service requirements, while optimizing costs, reducing incidents, disruption, and re-work. As a result, Change Enablement provides the speed and safety of change to keep up with an ever-changing market.

Another pro of Change Enablement is its ability to contribute to meeting regulatory requirements, whether legal, contractual, or governance. This is due to how documentation is a part of the Change Enablement process, updating the CMS and evaluating the change through a review by a board of people with an understanding of their stakeholders’ needs.

An example of this benefit is the implementation of the PDPA (Personal Data Protection Act). In the past, sensitive information like NRIC numbers had to be given in full when accessing government services like MediSave, which exposes users to identity fraud if that information is stolen. But with Change Enablement, the change being only the inclusion of the last four characters in one’s NRIC, this meets the legal requirements and brings value in terms of safety.

Another benefit of the practice is to give structure to an organisation on how change is processed. In larger companies like MNCs, it has many departments with their own ways of wanting change to be implemented. By having a formal, documented way of implementing change, this can standardize the process and prevent unauthorized changes from being made without knowing.

Pitfalls:

However, the process can result in extensive bureaucracy. Beginning with an RFC, the process goes down to recording, reviewing, assessing, and then evaluating the RFC. All that is done prior to building and testing a change. An example of this being a hinderance can be found in startups where the pace of business is different unlike larger companies. Startups implement change frequently as part of their way of business, and having a bureaucratic process would only slow progress and be counterproductive to such organizations.

Another pitfall of the Change Enable practice is the resistance to change itself. As show above in the example of benefits, a company with many departments would each have their own way of implementing change. This can cause conflict because they are already used to having change done in a way that was for them easier to understand and implement. But now with a documented process that is initially unfamiliar, there is a risk that because of their resistance to change, unauthorized changes are in turn made to circumvent this practice.

An example of such a pitfall was when the platform Discord required all users to change their usernames to something unique, removing a former system where each name had a number at the end as an identifier. Many users immediately didn’t like the change, citing reasons like ‘uniqueness’ with the numbers assigned, only one person can have a username unlike before. Example: Jeff#123 and Jeff#321 were two different users prior to this change.

Therefore, the Change Enablement practice must be made considering human factors like resistance to change, and how to better structure the process for easier understanding or containment. This could be done with Change Authorities where depending on the impact of the change, the relevant authorities would be involved in the assessing and decision making process before doing things like testing and validation.