

**"Riskipedia 2.0 -- Failure Factors that Fly Under the Radar: Hidden, Yet Debilitating Software Project Cripplers!** [DRAFT: WORK IN PROGRESS; SUBJECT TO CHANGE]

A revealing & stimulating discourse on **LEVEL 2 INTER-constituent clashes** & **INTRA-constituent conflicts & goal divergence** \* destroying software projects today -- and **what to do about them!**  
 (c) Copyright 2008 by Warren S. Reid All rights reserved. Expansion on the MBASE(c) model -- originally developed by Dr. Barry Boehm and his USC Graduate Students

\* **Goal Divergence can be strategic, tactical, organizational, procedural, technology, human factor, risk level & \$\$ conflicts & goal divergence**

**Constituent DIVERGENCE**

**USERS**

- DU.1 **PEOPLE:** "Change embracers" v "change spoilers" (including: ease of use; simplicity; robustness)
- DU.2 **PEOPLE:** Those who "need" new system vs. those OK w current processes/systems (change w/o benefit; data hoarders)
- DU.3 **PEOPLE:** Super Users (more functionality/features/"cool") v Regular (less feat's/simpl'ty make jobs easier, robustness)
- DU.4 **GOALS:** User Depts. w different goals: increase sales v lower costs v improve controls vs faster turnaround/lower stockouts v larger market share v more/diff metrics, etc.
- DU.5 **GOALS:** User Depts w diff go-live deadlines & accept crit'a
- DU.6 **STAFF:** Defining/resolving functional & process ambiguities/conflicts betw diff User Depts.(collective bargaining agreements, credit, overshipping)
- DU.7 **PEOPLE:** Time req'd/promised fm "best" SMEs v time made available
- DU.8 **PEOPLE:** Staff or Skill level req'd/promised v human resources made available
- DU.9 **PEOPLE:** "Failure by vengeance" (RRuff) (Grp A wants Vend A; U Grp B wts B; B selected; A hold Vend to F&F of desired Vend
- DU.10 **CHANGE:** Re-prioritize feature/function reqm'ts between different user groups - after priorities "agreed upon"

**INSIDE TECHNICAL RESOURCES:**  
**IT Dept: "M" (Maint/Ops) v IHD (In-house Dev/Tech)**

- DIT.1 **PEOPLE:** Where is CIO in org? VP-IM? Loyalties?
- DIT.2 **ROLE:** Dept percept/real'ty: M's crit 2 biz succ'ss?
- DIT.3 **PHILOSOPHY:** CIO belief/preference: In-house v O/Source (eg: IHD v. buy/config/custom/scratch, SaaS)
- DIT.4 **FUNDS/\$\$:** Dept budgets adequ'te? Budget alloc prop'ly bet M v IHD (based on work & reflecting macro-micro metrics)
- DIT.5 **PEOPLE:** M v IHD staff promo opps & rotation to keep turnover low: good level/skill mix; tools use; training; \$\$; QA; work
- DIT.6 **PROCESS:** Does applic turnover process fm IHD --> M support success? (i.e., suppt IHD & M in dual staff roles: M(s) assigned to dev project; key prod design/tester moves to M during sys turnover)
- DIT.7 **PHILOSOPHY:** Joint M v IHD resp for sys TDOTal Cost of Ownership
- DIT.8 **FUNDS/\$\$:** M v IHD environments: Compatible? Comparable?
- DIT.9 **PROCESS:** IHD v M enforced use of industry stds & methods
- DIT.10 **PHILOSOPHY:** Big X (bank) merge w Small x (banks) = < cust.
- DIT.11 **PEOPLE:** "Failure by vengeance" (RRuff) (Dev Grp A wants Vend A; Mt Grp B wts B; B wins; Dev A hold Vend to -abil/perf of desired Vend A

**Constituent DIVERGENCE**

- CU: USERS**
- CU.1 Many features
  - CU.2 Changeable requirements
  - CU.3 Applications compatibility
  - CU.4 High levels of service
  - CU.5 Voice in acquisition
  - CU.6 Flexible contract
  - CU.7 Early availability
  - CU.8 Add SMEs late in proj.

- CIH: IN-HOUSE DEVEL/MAINT**
- CIH.1 Ease of transition
  - CIH.2 Ease of maintenance
  - CIH.3 TDOTal cost ownership
  - CIH.4 Application compatibility
  - CIH.5 Voice in acquisition
  - CIH.6 In-house v outsource
  - CIH.7 Heroics

**Software Acquisition, Development & Implementation Clashes & Divergences**

The "HE SAID... SHE SAID..." Chart - for Failed Software Projects

#	Category: "abilities"	What Users, Acquirers, In-house IT Department Teams Say:	What Vendors, Software Developers, Systems Integrators Say:
1	Feasibility	System doesn't work; Not what we wanted	You changed your minds; You don't know what you want or need
2	Capability	You delivered limited functionality	You continually changed project scope
3	Compatibility	The system failed in the field & in production	You didn't perform required "business process reengineering" to make it work
4	Credibility	Your software, services & expertise were oversold	You conducted reference checks & DDiligence; What didn't you know?
5	Usability	No one can use system! Poor training	"Required staff" never came to primary or refresher training
6	Stability	System fundamentally flawed	We only need 2 months to fix it all
7	Culpability	You never told us that! You gave poor advice!	You didn't follow our recs; You changed/delayed making decisions
8	Reliability	The system is full of bugs!	Bad data conversion/interface cause probs. Always have bugs!
9	Responsibility	You failed as Systems Integration Proj. Mgr. - SIPM	No! YOU failed as the SIPM. That role was not my job!
10	Availability	Bait & Switch! You provided unqualified, unstable, uncommitted staff, PM(s), Steering Committee	YOU baited & switched! You provided unqualified, high T/O, unstable, uncommitted staff, PMs, Steering Committee
11	Suitability	You abandoned good Project Mgmt & System Development Life Cycle (SDLC) methods	You unwilling to comply w agreed to, promised & necessary methods (to save \$\$ w/o associated risk)

- CA: ACQUIRERS**
- CA.1 Mission cost effectiveness
  - CA.2 Limited developmt \$\$/sched
  - CA.3 Regulatory std compliance (Government & Industry)
  - CA.4 Cultural sensitivity
  - CA.5 Development visibility/control
  - CA.6 Rigorous contract
  - CA.7 Privacy and security
  - CA.8 Unrealistic Expectations

- CV: VENDORS/DEVELOPERS/INTEGRATORS/CONSULTANTS**
- CV.1 Flexible contract
  - CV.2 Ease meeting budget/schedule
  - CV.3 Stable requirements
  - CV.4 Freedom of choice: process
  - CV.5 Freedom of choice: team
  - CV.6 Freedom of choice: CDOTS/reuse
  - CV.7 Insufficient risk management
  - CV.8 Poor planning; estimates too early

**Constituent DIVERGENCE**

**ACQUIRERS**

- DA.1 **CHANGE:** Competing, changing, regional, confidential strategic biz priorities & opportunities
- DA.2 **CHANGE:** Long term vs. short term goals/needs
- DA.3 **CHANGE:** Competing, moving budgets/constraints
- DA.4 **PHILOSOPHY:** Best of breed vs. integrated (ERP) system
- DA.5 **PHILOSOPHY:** Bleeding/new tech v traditional
- DA.6 **PROCESS:** Lack of SH buy-in (eg: pric'g investmt opp; Bank hold'g co.
- DA.7 **PHILOSOPHY:** Custom new info sys v chg biz procs (degree)
- DA.8 **STAFF:** Savvy v non-tec: Board, CXOs, VP-IM, Steer'g Com.
- DA.9 **CHANGE:** Change in IT's role; Importance of IT's role
- DA.10 **CHANGE:** Divergent philosophies
- DA.11 **STRATEGY:** Biz Case -- Build v license v acquire
- DA.12 **PHILOSOPHY:** CSF: Override users (i.e., "quotations")
- DA.13 **CHANGE:** Behind your back to country club buddy (HAL)

**OUTSIDE TECHNICAL RESOURCES:**

**Vendors/Developers/Integrators/Consultants**

- DOT.1 **PEOPLE:** Well staffed vs. under-staffed
- DOT.2 **PEOPLE:** Well staffed vs. skills imbalance
- DOT.3 **PEOPLE:** Best staff remain vs. moved elsewhere
- DOT.4 **PEOPLE:** Sales v devel v maint (prom'se v reality)
- DOT.5 **PROCESS:** Chg stds, tools, doc, SDLC mid-project
- DOT.6 **PEOPLE:** Maverick vs. industry std methodology
- DOT.7 **FUNDS/\$\$:** Customer funding for new, expanded General Release (in same/sub-industry) v 1-off custom
- DOT.8 **FUNDS/\$\$:** Need for "reference-able customer"
- DOT.9 **FUNDS/\$\$:** Aband. promised/proven QA meths to make up \$/sched target: cut corners testing, UAT, train'g, convert, go-live ready
- DOT.10 **FUNDS/\$\$:** Financial wherewithal & product lifecycle position
- DOT.11 **PROCESS:** Abandon Critical Path & Earned Value
- DOT.12 **PHILOSOPHY:** Development vs. Maintenance Balance
- DOT.13 **PEOPLE:** Release Dates & User Group Conferences
- DOT.14 **PEOPLE:** Sales (60-80K + 2-5% +% Mt.) v Sales Supt (100-140K + Bonus on Grp Prof\$ + Refer'ls + Mt.; "Good Sales - hd 2 find - Short-term Commiss- Oversell'r" --> "EZ", "Sure", "Next Rel." v "Nxt yr", "No", "Invest'!")

**Constituent DIVERGENCE**

- **SW is diff fm other product analogies:** SW NOT magic -- complex, powerful, universal - like nuclear energy; radically malleable; Infrastruct
- **SW story = (1) Us/our incentives;** Users want Hi F&F/utility, yet inconsist'tly value their security & all most else! So, devels incentivized to REDUCE sw qa (or NOT persue w suffic't ZEAL) to encour need for extensive patches/Maint & tune new sw licenses to their benefit;
- **(2) No enforced sw dev cont'ls** creates incntvs for the corrupt/predatory; **(3) no global jurisdic'l coher'ce** : govt d/n/want to hurt \$\$ IT econ;
- **(4) Open Source/OS** >legal immune/no improv \$\$
- **Only Texas has SW Eng** . licens'g ('99). No univ accept'd certif for sw devs. V certs diff. ["Geekonomics: Real Cost of Insecure SW " D Rice]

(c) Copyright 2008 by Warren S. Reid All rights reserved.