**Qantas – Australian airline**  
**Project name:**Jetsmart  
**Date:**Feb 2008 **Cost:** $40M

Jetsmart was a parts management system implementation. The software has issues going back to 2004, it was said that the software was too difficult to use and unnecessarily increased the workload of the users. The worker’s union at the time advised the mechanics to not assist with the implementation of the program.

Qantas Engineering’s executive general manager, David Cox, acknowledged problems with the system saying, "During the development phase some issues arose with the system, training and the management of change.” (Krigsman, 2008)

We can see from this that from the get go there were problems with the systems simplicity and people found it hard to learn, this showed that certain parts of the system were not implemented from a usability view point.

Qantas’s Chief Financial officer is quoted as having said “We wouldn’t ask the engineers what their views on our software systems were. We’ll put in what we think is the appropriate for us”.(Ryder, 2008)

From this quote, we can see that there was a strange attitude towards the engineers who would be using the system. It seems that even though the main problem with the system was the training of the engineers the chief financial officer purposely decided to build the system in the way he thought best and not what would be best for the users. Due to poor management on the Jetsmart project the system was doomed from the start. By not taking the input of the engineers involved, the users wouldn’t feel confident working with the software that was designed by people who were not qualified to determine the needs of the software. These plane engineers would be responsible for the lives of thousands of passengers every day, so software that was not made with their expertise would be dangerous to use. Not only would the engineers not feel confident but anyone who read the comments of the Chief Financial officer would feel fear towards the success of the problem as it is clear there is a problem with management not being able to understand basic IT issues.

If we go back to 1995 we can find this description of the Qantas IT infrastructure, “The carrier's 50-year-old IT shop is presently wrestling with the management of 700-odd applications, many of which are written in older programming languages such as COBOL and FORTRAN, and serviced by an aging group of programmers.” (Krigsman, 2008)

We can see here that before development of the Jetsmart system Qantas already had a complex and difficult IT infrastructure. Out dated programmers and programs were holding the company back and costing it money. When Jetsmart came in as an attempt to modernize the infrastructure it was already at risk due to the poor planning of all the systems that came before it.

A better software development process for the Jetsmart project could have been easily implemented. The main problems with the system were poor management and worker’s union issues.

To fix the issues in the software development cycle there should have been more user input. The engineers who would have been using the system were taking out of the design process. This lead to fear within the worker’s union who refused to help with the implementation of a system that they didn’t deem helpful. If the engineers had been involved with the implementation of the system, instead of being ignored by management, the system could have been designed correctly. Meaning that the stakeholders wouldn’t have been so afraid to continue supporting the program as it wouldn’t have been rejected by the people who were meant to use it.
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