

# **DEBRIEFING REPORT**

Prepared by: Charles M Richter

Date Written: 24 July, 1996

Date Printed: 10 January 2015

## **1. Purpose**

This report describes the results I achieved at WorkCover and the difficulties I faced.

## **2. Background**

I responded to the WorkCover contract in September 1995 but was unsuccessful.

The successful candidate took up the contract in October 1995 and resigned one week later. I was approached and offered the contract, which I accepted.

## **3. Results Achieved**

The following is a brief resume of my activities since November 1995:

1. Reviewed the ACP/CWG (Accident, Claim, Policy/Client, Workplace, Geographic) Conceptual Data Model;
2. Developed the WorkCover Corporate Information Repository;
3. Assisted in the design of the CRE (Corporate Reporting Environment) Data and System Models;
4. Developed the Grant Secretariat Data and System Models;
5. Assisted with the design of the Information Centre Data Model;
6. Developed the Conciliation Data Model;
7. Assisted the Legal Branch with their package evaluation criteria;
8. Developed the HPA (Hazardous Product Assessment) Data Model, System Model and Data Base Design;
9. Assisted with the documenting of the Corporate Performance Indicators;
10. Developed the 1996 IT Strategic Alignment Plan;
11. Identified the gaps between the 1991, 1992 Infrastructure and 1996 IT Alignment Plans;
12. Developed the IT CASE Tool Evaluation criteria;
13. Analysed LBMS Systems Engineer V6.1 and S-Designor V5.

### **3.1 Reviewed the ACP/CWG Conceptual Data Model**

I was primarily contracted (November 1995) to carry out tasks to fulfil the requirements as laid out in the "Review of ACP/CWG Conceptual Data Model" (see Appendix 1). I completed this task on the 6th December 1995. I wrote 2 reports and delivered my findings to the persons mentioned in a memo (see Appendix 2). The two reports are located in the c:\chas directory (rel1audt.doc and acp2audt.doc)

Whilst the Reports highlight the fact that the Data Base Design was being audited, rather than the Conceptual Data Mode, my findings were that the Conceptual Data Model and the Data Base Design were identical. Hence any shortcoming found in the Data Base Design could be attributed to a shortcoming in the Conceptual Model.

### **3.2 Developed the WorkCover Corporate Information Repository**

In order to review CWG and ACP, I first had to gain an understanding of WorkCover's Business. As I was not able to directly interface with Users (due to time and other constraints) I had to use existing documentation. I also had to rely on limited access to some IT personnel.

During this initial task I was able to build a profile of WorkCover's Information needs. The tool that WorkCover had available (LBMS System Engineer V5.1) was not suitable for the task at hand (at least I did not think it was). I therefore had to rely on a tool that I had built. This tool enabled me to rapidly build a Corporate wide repository. The contents of this repository included:

1. WorkCover's Performance Indicators;
2. Over 500 Information Items which I considered WorkCover needed.

### **3.3 Assisted in the design of the CRE Data Model**

I assisted the CRE Project team develop the Conceptual and Logical Data Models as well as the Data Base design they required to assist them meet their and their User's needs.

During this exercise I continued to expand the Information requirements in the Corporate Repository. I was able to use the Information requirements to map out the Activities and Systems the CRE team and their users would require.

### **3.4 Developed the Grant Secretariat Data and System Models**

I supported the Small Business Systems Group (SBSG) and their Grant Secretariat Users by developing the Conceptual and Logical Data Models as well as the Data Base design they required to assist them meet their needs.

During this exercise I continued to expand the Information requirements in the Corporate Repository. I was able to use the Information requirements to map out the Activities and Systems the Grant Secretariat Users would require.

### **3.5 Assisted with the design of the Information Centre Data Model**

I assisted the SBSG develop the Conceptual and Logical Data Models as well as the Data Base design they required to assist them meet their needs.

During this exercise I continued to expand the Information requirements in the Corporate Repository.

### **3.6 Developed the Conciliation Data Model**

I supported the SBSG and their Conciliation Users by developing the Conceptual and Logical Data Models as well as the Data Base design they required to assist them meet their needs.

During this exercise I continued to expand the Information requirements in the Corporate Repository. I was able to use the Information requirements to map out the Activities and Systems the Conciliation Users would require.

### **3.7 Assisted the Legal Branch with their package evaluation criteria**

I assisted the SBSG evaluate a number of packages to support the Legal Branch with their requirements. 11 responses were received, 6 were culled due to lack of fit, 2 were short listed and 3 were earmarked as second string.

To date the 2 short listed packages have proved to be unsuitable.

### **3.8 Developed the HPA Data Model, System Model and Data Base Design**

I supported the HPA Project Team and their Users by developing the Conceptual and Logical Data Models as well as the Data Base design they required to assist them meet their needs.

During this exercise I continued to expand the Information requirements in the Corporate Repository. I was able to use the Information requirements to map out the Activities and Systems the HPA Users would require.

### **3.9 Assisted with the documenting of the Corporate Performance Indicators**

The Corporate Planning Group released the 1996 WorkCover Key Result Areas. A meeting of Branch Managers was held to determine their Performance Indicators (PI).

I assisted the Corporate Planning Group by documenting and defining the PIs. The definitions were ratified by the Corporate Planning Group.

### **3.10 Developed the 1996 IT Strategic Alignment Plan**

The Corporate Planning Group identified a number of Users who could assist my identify additional Information Items by using the Performance Indicators.

A number of 1 hour sessions were held to carry out this task.

At the end of this exercise I had sufficient Information items to help me identify the Actions and Systems that WorkCover would need to support their Information needs. This exercise resulted in the 1996 IT Strategic Alignment Plan document, which contained the bridge between the Business requirements (PIs) and the IT requirements (Information, Functions and Systems). This plan was presented to the CIC on the 29th May 1996.

### **3.11 Identified the gaps between the 1991, 1992 Infrastructure and 1996 IT Alignment Plans**

The 1996 IT Strategic Alignment Plan was presented to the Corporate Information Committee (CIC), however as the plan appeared to be too complicated. The CIC requested a report explaining the differences between the 1992 Infrastructure and the 1996 IT Strategic Alignment. This report was submitted to the CIC on the 19th June 1996.

### **3.12 Developed the IT CASE Tool Evaluation criteria**

I developed evaluation criteria to assist WorkCover in its selection of a CASE Tool.

### **3.13 Analysed LBMS Systems Engineer V6.1 and S-Designor V5**

I evaluated the two CASE Tools WorkCover are most likely to use. My evaluation focused principally on the Data Modelling and subsequent generation of Informix SQL create table statements.

## **4. Difficulties Faced**

In achieving the above results, I had to face a number of difficulties. These are itemised under each of the result headings.

### **4.1 Reviewed the ACP/CWG Conceptual Data Model**

From the very outset of my task there appeared to be a reluctance on the part of a number of WorkCover staff and contractors to provide me with voluntary support. It would appear that all parties concerned felt that there was no need to have 'yet another review' of their work. The CWG Systems Manager and team leader both made it extremely difficult for me to carry out my task as I appeared to ask questions and propose solutions which did not 'fit' their existing solution.

Despite their opposition, I completed my task. Further hostility was directed towards me when I presented my findings and recommendations.

None of my recommendations were accepted. The shortcomings in both the CWG and ACP models are still evident and continues to require more maintenance work.

### **4.2 Developed the WorkCover Corporate Information Repository**

I had no difficulties carrying out this task.

### **4.3 Assisted in the design of the CRE Data and System Models**

I had no difficulties with this task. The Team leader and DBA at the time gave me sufficient support. The results achieved are indicative of this support.

### **4.4 Developed the Grant Secretariat Data and System Models**

I had no difficulties with this task. The SBSG developer and I worked well together. The end result was the Grant Secretariat Users had a system developed for them within the specified time.

### **4.5 Assisted with the design of the Information Centre Data Model**

I had no difficulties with this task. The SBSG Developer and I worked well together. The end result was that the Information Centre Users had a system developed for them within the specified time.

### **4.6 Developed the Conciliation Data Model**

I had no difficulties with this task. The SBSG Developer and I worked well together. The Street report has placed this system on hold.

### **4.7 Assisted the Legal Branch with their package evaluation criteria**

I had no difficulties with this task. The SBSG Developer and I worked well together. The packages evaluated to date do not appear to be able to support the Legal Branch's requirements.

### **4.8 Developed the HPA Data Model, System Model and Data Base Design**

Initially I had no difficulties with this task. The HPA User, project manager, systems analyst and I worked well together. The deliverables produced were understood by all parties concerned.

Once the CWG/ACP System Manager began to get involved, the entire project was thrown into disarray. There is every likelihood that the system sorely needed by the HPA group is now in jeopardy. There is also the likelihood that the CWG data base will not be able to support the HPA requirements.

#### **4.9 Assisted with the documenting of the Corporate Performance Indicators**

I had no difficulties with this task. The Corporate Strategic Planning staff and I worked well together. The end result was that a number of PIs were documented.

However, as not all managers were involved, further sessions will have to be conducted in order to address this.

#### **4.10 Developed the 1996 IT Strategic Alignment Plan**

I had difficulties carrying out this task. The majority managers assisted me without much reservation, however a few managers were openly hostile. The hostility may not have been intentionally leveled against me in particular but rather against the fact that this exercise was being carried out at all. They felt as if the hour they spent with me was a 'complete waste of their time'.

I feel it is important to point out that a cost justification report written prior to the commencement of the exercise, showed a distinct benefit to WorkCover. A post exercise cost benefit analysis showed a saving of over \$500,000 when compared to the 1992 Infrastructure project.

#### **4.11 Identified the gaps between the 1991, 1992 Infrastructure and 1996 IT Alignment Plans**

I had no difficulties carrying out this task. However, there has been open hostility when I did not openly endorse the 1992 Infrastructure.

#### **4.12 Developed the IT CASE Tool Evaluation criteria**

I had no difficulties carrying out this task. At the time of writing this report, I am still waiting on the Systems Development Unit to provide me with their criteria.

#### **4.13 Analysed LBMS Systems Engineer V6.1 and S-Designor V5**

I had no difficulties with task. I have established that which ever CASE Tool WorkCover selects, they will have problems.

### **5. Conclusion**

As a result of all of the above, the following is the conclusion that I have come to.

1. The selection of DMR's P+ methodology, the understanding of P+ by the various stakeholders and the implementation of P+, has played a major role in the difficulties that I and others have faced;
2. The various stakeholders have interpreted parts of P+ differently from others.