Please note: I will be drawing from the project I have consistantly been refering to throughout the course. This project has not been implemented so I will be writing this asssignment as though it has

**Task 1**

Problam identified :

**Proposed solution**

Being a client facing function that we fullfill at my place of work, we faced with a vary critcal and potentially detrimantal problem to the organasation. We have an ever changing proccess that it becomes difficult to all mantian a consistancy in our interaction with clients. Due to these inconsistancies clients end up having to perfom more than once on a single issue and this agitates them and a lot have requested to cut ties with the organization due to this. The function we fulfil is driven my a legislative requirement, so it is organization(bank) wide, but all areas of the bank that are involved are following their own processes around this function.

Note: Additions are bolded

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Symptoms**   * Inconsistences in work flow * Agents not being aware of process changes * Time consumed by fixing mistakes due to not knowing processes. * Management feeling its being ignored * Agents going to other agents to verify information * **More people’s work failing the QA process** * **Departments carry out their own functions around the same function** * **Clients end up feeling like we running a schame** * **This leads to use pushing clients to the branches more and more (Unfortunately branch staff are not trained on this function**) |
|  |  |
|  | **Root cause**   * Email is cluttered by system updates and organization’s news * Long emails from team leaders * Inconsistent messages due to inconsistent understanding of management instructions * Target driven environment (no time to check emails) * Agents hasient to approuch their team leaders * **This function is not standardised across the whole bank** |

The department needs a better way to communicate process, a way that will ensure that everyone has access, a way that is simple and that allows management to monitor and ultimately alter the the presented process as desired. This solution is a Web Application hosted internally that graphically and textually outlines the processes. This page allows anyone to build a process visually and textually. This program can be written by our own internal IT department

ii.

The scope statement is missing the function of making other departments aware of this function and incorraging them to use the Process Log as a reference for this function. Proccess log will be a cheap and effective way to synchronise all these departments around the function. The scope statements seeks to look at the processes of other departments so they can refine their processes. This is beyond the scope of the the project. The project is about building a system to house processes for those that work with them to access. It doesn’t define the process, although agents will have acess to processes from different departments

## Project Scope

### Project description

The project will involve the creation of a web application that catalogues processes called, ‘the Process Log’, it will visually convey department processes and allow for easy and quick customization of the process. The Process Log will be accessed by all employees, and will be accessed through their working computer via a link that will be provided. It will have an elaborate search function, which allows agents to search for their departments within the organization and have access to all that department’s processes (other departments not part of the scope of the current project). Processes can be bookmarked and referred to easily. Process log can be customized by team leaders using its easy interface.

### Deliverables

* The Project’s aim is to deliver a working, easy to use browser-based web application.
* Introduce the CRS function and the Process Log to other departments

### Stakeholders

* COO of the division
* Channel manager
* Team leaders
* Compliance
* Business Analyst
* Developers
* Training facilitator
* Users (Agents)
* Road show crew: Additions from previous projects, they will be visiting the various departments that affect or are affected by this function and giving them the context of the function and presenting the process log.
* Government

### Resources Required

* Human resources required:
  + Business analyst
  + Compliance officer
  + Training facilitator
  + Team leaders of segments
  + UX, UI Developer
  + Server Developer
  + Database Developer
  + Testers
  + Agents
* General resources
  + Computers (Internet, server, Database)
  + Transportatoin of the road show crew to
  + Depending on technology used: Third party libraries
  + Road show crew

### Acceptance criteria

* A tested final product that does what it is meant to do
* Ethan Shirto’s (Channel Manager) Signoff
* Team leaders of the CRS’s signoff
* Successful test with users

### The project will be accepted as successful when

* An easy to use Application and content that is easy to understand
* IT quality assurance signed off on the technical integrity of the application
* Deployment of the application on internal server
* After the Team leaders of the CRS department have Vetted the product
* 5 agents testing the application for 1 day

### Limitations & Risk

## Table 3.1: Risk management plan

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risks** | **Category** | **Reason** | **Contingency** |
| **Human resources** |  |  |  |
| Absenteeism | Mitigate | If not the project will delay and increase cost | Developerswillbe given the opportunity to work from home and will be requested to not take annual leave during the project. The senior java developer is an integral part of the project so a 6-day reserve (R 13 920) for their cost will be placed on the budget, this will be in case of the project losing them. I estimate 6 days will be enough for another developer to study the code and documentation and restructure the code if necessary, before continuing the development process. These 6 days will also come in where there are any delays in the development process. A 2-day reserve will be placed for the database developer (R 3680) and the UI/UX developer (R 4160), I don’t foresee these 2 developers delaying the completion date due to them doing the work during the same time as the server development which takes a longer time. But the 2 days will come in where there are delivery delays for their work |
| Incapable developers | Mitigate | This will affect the quality of work produced and bring in bugs that will have to be sorted which will increase project time | We will keep constant communication with the IT team leader for them to vat the quality and speed of work. Those developers who are proving to be incapable and/or slow we will monitor closely and at take action regularly including but not limited to removing them from the project. The 6 days for the java developer and 2 days for the database and UI/UX developer reserves mentioned above will act as a cushion if we have to replace a developer. This will give them time to get up to speed |
| Resignation | Mitigate | If not the project will delay and increase cost | Developers that are selected must have a notice period in case of resignation. This will give us the opportunity to get a replacement developer and get them up to speed with what and how they will be developing. The above-mentioned reserves will come in if the notice period is avoided |
| **Stakeholders** |  |  |  |
| Channel manger or COO resigning | Avoid | I do not have the power to influence this action. The new person will continue the project once they are up to speed | We will document our interactions to insure that if they are ever unavailable whoever will take their place will have a good idea of what the project is about and where it is |
| **Materials** |  |  |  |
| System crashes | Mitigate | If not the project will delay and increase cost | We will incorporate the regular use a version control tool e.g. Git, Mercurial, Azure Devops where on each milestone of the development timeline a copy of the app (all the files making up the app so far) is saved on the cloud and in the case of any crashes or corruption of files we can go back to the latest working version**.** |
| **Financial** |  |  |  |
| Incompatible technologies | Mitigate | If not the project will delay and increase cost | The development process will stick to tried and tested best practices. In case of any serious misalignments a reserve of R 5604.32 is added to the budget for tools, plugins, advise portals and incidentals. |
| **Activities** |  |  |  |
| Process change | Avoid | The development does not depend on the content. It depends on the functionality | No action will be taken, this function will be done by the team leaders once the functionality to add process is built. |
| **Financial risk** |  |  |  |
| Delays in the project | Mitigate | This will result in more costs | An additional amount will be included in the cost of the project which will be used for any delays that could occur |

### Assumption and exclusions

The IT department has enough expertise to develop and deploy the application. They will not be met with major technical heddles that will drastically increase the project time. The project will not involve refinement of the business processes that is the job of management, the project will only interpret their wishes in an easy to understand manner. The implementation of the road show will not form part of this project this will be done through a separate project. This project will only develop a brief for the new road show project.

iii.

There will be an addition of stakeholders from the previous stakeholder list. The addition of the roadshow crew. These are individuals that will go to other areas of the bank that are either affected or affect this function.

iv.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Stakeholder | Strategy’s effectiveness | Example | Changes |
| **Business analyst** | The strategy to elicit more support from this stakeholder worked. Particularly the strategy of having a presentation with the business unit COO at the end of the project . | The stakeholder was keen to provide help beyond their function in the project. They offered to rework the business requirements after hearing that there was a change of process | I would have a mid project meeting and try to get the channel manager and the COO to attend |
| **COO of the department** | Due to there being no need for more support than we got from the COO no action was taken to elicite more support. This is due to having the channel manager as a go between and the COO not concerning themselves with axillary oporations at this level | We deal with the Channel manager | I wouldn’t change how we interacted with the COO. Except I would try get another mid project meeting with them to encarage the project team and give them an opportunity to present themselves |
| **Channel manager** | Due to them being the project sponser I would change the lack of action to elicit more success from the stakeholder because they had significant interest in the success of the project | The stakeholder has a lot of interest in the success of this project | No changes |
| **Compliance officer** | The strategy to elicit more support from this stakeholder worked. Particularly the strategy of having a presentation with the business unit COO at the end of the project . | The stakeholder was keen to provide help beyond their function in the project. They offered to rework the business requirements after hearing that there was a change of process | I would have a mid project meeting and try to get the channel manager and the COO to attend |
| **Team leaders of segments** | Empheizing the benefit that will come from the project for this stakeholder’s worked in getting more support from them. However I realised I didn’t need to much support from them | There suggestions spoke to the process but the project focused on the system. We where building a system not the process | I would focus less on these stakeholders |
| **Road show crew** | The Road show crew should have beyond the scope of this project, Because their work only would begin after the project ends. | They did nothing during the project and having them around was a waste of their time. | I woud have prepared a brief for a road show project to be implemented after the process log project |
| **Developers**  UX, UI designer  Server Developer  Database Developer  Testers | I don’t trying to get more support from these stakeholders was the best idea. Because they suggestions where complex to understand, and approve by the project manager. They almost caused a lot of scope creep in suggesting things that would have increase the size of the project | They ended up suggesting using artificial intelligence (AI) to track what agents search and suggest topics for them to look | I would respectfully give them what they need to build and go no feather |
| **Agents** | The strategy to have meetings with them after a feature has been completed was a good and bad idea | We ended up having meetings to present features that didn’t show anything on the screen (technical in nature). But where we had features that they | I would pick where times where we had features that could be demostrated to the stakeholder |
| **Training facilitator**  (Additions from previous list ) | The strategy to elicit more support from this stakeholder worked. Particularly the strategy of having a presentation with the business unit COO at the end of the project | The stakeholder was keen to provide help beyond their function in the project. They offered to rework the business requirements after hearing that there was a change of process | I would have a mid project meeting and try to get the channel manager and the COO to attend |
| **SARS/government**  (Additions from previous list ) | We where correct not to try elicit support | SARS is external and changes process through their own process. Lobbying SARS wouldn’t be feaseble | Nothing would be changed |

The tools used for the decomposition of work in the project is the WBS, which defined the work that needed to be done and a Gantt chart which break down the delivarables into time based milestones and also assigned resources to the tasks. The break down of work was was down on a task bases because the tasks are technical the work done to accamplish the task was not included, this provided enough detial to effectively control the project. Attached is the WBS and the GANTT chart used in the project

Task 2

1. The project Gantt chat was used as the project schedule and I will be refering to it (please refer to the Gantt chart at the end of the document). The project was set to tak 40.63 days starting from the **Mon 20/03/02 to the Tue 20/04/21** the project was completed in 35 days, same delivarables where completed earlier than planned and the project schedule was than adjusted to accommodate the early completion. The table that immidiately follows this paragraph tabulates the key delivarables, this table looks at the wether the task was on time, and if not what the variance was. The table looks at corrective measures taken for the one developer that went above their allotted time.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Delivarable | Achieved on time | variance | Corrective measures |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

1. Following is a table that shows those stakeholder I would have taken a different communication strategy with:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Stakeholder | Used strategy | Different strategy | Reasons |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **budgeted** | **Actual** | **variance** | **Corrective action** |
| Appoint business analyst | R6 505.68 | R6 505.68 | R0.00 |  |
| Content developer | R1 920.00 | R3 792.00 | -R1 872.00 |  |
| Security libraries and plugins | R1 500.00 | R1 200.00 | R300.00 |  |
| Server developer (Java developer) |  |  |  |  |
| ·         Senior developer | R58 000.00 | R23 200.00 | R34 800.00 |  |
| ·         Junior developer | R28 000.00 | R11 200.00 | R16 800.00 |  |
| Database developer | R9 200.00 | R5 520.00 | R3 680.00 |  |
| Internal server hosting (main application) | R400.00 | R400.00 | R0.00 |  |
| cloud storage | R540.00 | R400.00 | R140.00 |  |
| Content delivery network (CDN) hosting | R250.00 | R250.00 | R0.00 |  |
| Software testers | R960.00 | R1 920.00 | -R960.00 |  |
| UI & UX developer | R35 360.00 | R35 360.00 | R0.00 |  |

1. The 2 members that I choice are the database developer and the frontend developer
2. The following are the risks that either where seen and planned form or where not seen and their effect on the project. The risks mationed below are those which where not seen and planned for or where seen but the contengancy plan was not effective.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Risk | Forseen or not | Contengancy plan | Effectiveness of plan |

Task 3