

Genericorp developed an EIS. The EIS had sponsorship from senior executives. The project ran smoothly and was completed successfully. However, after 9 months it became clear that the EIS was stagnate and in disuse. The EIS was cut to save money. The EIS at Genericorp failed for three reasons: 1) Users were not heavily involved in the creation of the system. 2) The EIS failed to expand due to a lack of continued leadership. And 3) the idea for the EIS was championed by a nonuser.

Perry, the leader of the project found difficulty in gathering requirements from senior executives. The senior executives liked the idea, but none went out of their way to lead the implementation of the project. They were hard to reach and were not terribly sure of what they wanted. Perry had to rely on the input of nonusers, the staff and secretaries.

Perry planned for the EIS to evolve from an Executive Information System to an Everybody's information system. Two programmers were assigned to maintain the system and to include additional dashboards as needed. From the article, it appears these programmers saw the EIS as a toy, a pet project for executives. They were clearly detached from the project and saw it as a secondary assignment. No leadership was present to assist them in expanding the EIS. They did not even appear to consult other users or executives about additional potential needs such as new information and dashboards.

The EIS itself was championed by a nonuser. Perry was not a senior executive. Although the idea for an EIS was supported by senior executives, the push for the system was not coming from them. A couple of them did not even seem to fully understand how or why to use a computer. The project would have been more successful if a senior executive was present from the beginning, leading requirements gathering, and testing dashboards. The project itself would probably have been ended when discussing the alternatives. Many of the executives didn't see an advantage in digital over paper distribution of the information. The project would have been scrapped much earlier, and Perry's reputation would not have been destroyed. Instead of a failed investment, the EIS would have simply been a good idea, just a little too ahead of its time.