**Change Control Management Pain Point Definitions (100625)**

| Pain Point | Definition |
| --- | --- |
| Every single group within Molex manages change differently and this lack of standardization leads to increased probability of errors | Different teams follow varied change steps, tools, or rules, producing inconsistent execution and higher error rates. |
| Molex relies too much on weekly meetings & email communications to execute change today | Change coordination depends on manual meetings and email threads rather than automated, auditable workflows, causing delays and information loss. |
| A consistent process of change is rarely used due to pace of work & many employees, "just trying to keep their heads above water" | Employees skip or shortcut required change steps because workload and speed pressures make full process adherence impractical. |
| Wasted Time / delays due to functions not receiving Change Notifications | Stakeholders miss timely alerts about changes, requiring manual follow-ups and causing implementation delays. |
| Increased workload & Churn in PD and at the manufacturing plants to correct errors | Product development and plant teams spend excessive time fixing avoidable change-related errors and rework. |
| High levels of scrap from procurement due to unused excess inventory or incorrect parts/components and unused WIP | Incorrect or mistimed changes lead to wrong parts being ordered or produced, generating scrap and stranded inventory. |
| Reputational / Brand damage from shipping incorrect revisions to customers | Customers receive products with wrong or outdated revisions, eroding trust and damaging brand reputation. |
| Design change process is uni-directional, no confirmation or feedback from manufacturing that change detail was received and understood | Changes are sent downstream without an acknowledged, traceable feedback loop confirming manufacturing receipt and understanding. |
| Metrics can drive wrong behavior | Performance measures unintentionally encourage hiding problems or gaming results instead of surfacing and resolving issues. |
| Lack of comprehensive design review process with clear accountability | Design reviews lack standardized steps and assigned owners, so responsibility and thoroughness are inconsistent. |
| Difficult to identify everyone required to evaluate change and those whom the change needs to be communicated to | It is hard to determine the full set of stakeholders and reviewers who must assess or be informed about a change. |
| Scope of Product Development change management process not clearly defined (end to end) | The boundaries, inputs/outputs, and lifecycle stages of PD change management are ambiguous or incomplete. |
| Molex is not effectively leveraging PR (problem report) functionality | Problem-reporting tools/processes exist but are underused or not integrated into change workflows, limiting their value. |
| Change process is not known or understood across Molex | Many employees lack awareness or understanding of the formal change process, its steps, and when to use it. |
| Change process is interpreted and executed differently by different groups and plants | Teams apply their own interpretations of the process, leading to inconsistent execution and outcomes across sites. |
| Plants often have internal / local change process that duplicates efforts of corporate process | Local plant procedures replicate corporate work instead of aligning with enterprise processes, causing redundant effort. |
| Decision rights of who can approve changes is not always known or consistent | Approval authority and responsibilities are unclear or inconsistent, producing bottlenecks and duplicated approvals. |
| Much confusion / disagreement on role and level of change management necessary before a product is officially in production versus after it is in production | No shared standard exists for required rigor and control for pre‑production versus post‑production changes. |
| Different Groups & Functions are at different levels of adoptions of current change process and tools | Some teams fully use change tools/processes while others do not, creating uneven maturity and capability across the organization. |
| There is generally a lack of use of the existing asynchronous feedback processes (PR) | Asynchronous channels (e.g., PRs) are not routinely used to capture and act on issues outside synchronous meetings. |