**Evaluation of Implementation Methods**

*Direct cut-over*

For direct cut-over implementation, the old system is dropped simultaneously to the new system being used, this means that the new system is immediately available and the old system is unavailable. The positives of this method is that the process of implementation is very quick and it is the cheapest method because there is no period of supporting two systems in any capacity. The negatives of the system are that it is quite risky because there are no backups of the old system, so if there is a problem with the new system, there is no alternative. There is also likely to be user frustration and/or confusion as they will not be familiar with the new system.

*Parallel*

For parallel implementation, both the old and new system run concurrently for a period of time, allowing the users to work with both systems. The positives of this method is that users can get familiar with the new system, however, if there is a problem or they can’t figure out how to do certain tasks, they can use the old system instead. This also allows for major problems to be fixed in the new system. However, the problems with this method are that it can be quite expensive having to pay for two separate systems. Additionally, users may just not use the new system at all and stick to the old system exclusively. Lastly, this method can take some time to complete.

*Phased*

For phased implementation, features of the old system are gradually replaced with the new system. This is sometimes used to introduce new features as they are developed, or for the gradual implementation of big projects. The positives of this method is that new features can be tested and shown to work, it also prevents the users from being overwhelmed with a whole new system, and instead gradually familiarises them with it. The drawbacks from this method is that it can be expensive to support two systems and it can also mean that it takes a long time to implement a new system with this method. It can also cause stress to the users when they have to use two systems simultaneously.

*Pilot*

For pilot implementation, a small group is chosen from the main user base and they are given the new system to use while the rest of the users still use the old system. Then after testing, the new system is implemented while the old system is dropped. This allows for the new system to be tested so that there are no issues when the new system takes over. The positives of this method is the testing that allows for problems to be removed as well as user feedback allowing for the new system to be refined further to allow for better usage by the users. The negatives of this method are that it requires a large main user base for a small subsection to be chosen, it can also be expensive to support two systems, and there can be data issues with having two groups running alternate systems.

*Recommendation*

I would recommend the direct cut-over implementation method. This is because there is no pre-existing system that the users are currently using and because I want the users to have access to the game as fast as possible.