

Message

From: Shaun Turner [IMCEAEX-
_O=EXCHANGELABS_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29_CN=RECIPIENTS_CN=88651F0422.
SHAUN+2ETURNE@GRO]
Sent: 24/08/2017 18:11:12
To: Julie Thomas [julie.thomas@GRO]
Subject: Implementation Options

Julie,

I hope you don't mind me sending you a brain dump of some of the conversations I have been having with the Business Analysts in terms of some thoughts on EUM implementation, especially reflecting on the concerns about EUM training controls where training lapses. I am still very much of the mind that EUM as a technical solution alone is going to be a very painful way of achieving the cultural changes we need to see relating to regulatory compliance training and the importance branches attach to it, but having said that I also think until the business bites the bullet on some level of discomfort (letting the system do what it was designed to do and police compliance) then branches will believe, quite rightly, that we will never have the stomach to turn access to products/Horizon off.

Reflecting on this tension over the past few days, I have been gathering some thoughts on whether there is a way of having a 'gentler' implementation which allows FS and Network to meet somewhere in the middle. I expect this has been one of your main preoccupations too. Putting this challenge to the BA's we have come up with the following potential options and observations:

1. In recognition of current levels of compliance test performance (30% of users still non-compliant at deadline) if you deploy EUM as planned you either have a substantial number of branches/users having a period of disruption along with the resource impact in NBSC/HRSC of administering training extensions, or you need resources deployed to contact branches in advance of the test date to ensure those aforementioned levels of disruption are 'acceptable' or manageable.
2. A technical solution which allows branches to self-serve when they are locked out of Horizon is in the CR, but (a) this is business case dependent and then will take time to develop and (b) would only fix the issue of NBSC/HRSC resource requirements to administer the training extensions, not the branch/customer disruption caused by users being locked out.
3. The lion's share of HR data maintenance resources will be in the daily updating of training records as users take their test and this feeds through to HR. This level of resource increases the more branches we push out there whilst ever we are not (a) integrated with SF and (b) do not have a link between Horizon learning data and SF Learning.
4. Given points 1-3 above, it might make more sense to rollout the POID control element of EUM (i.e. everyone needs to have a POID and new Horizon User IDs set up) but not to have system enforcement of training controls at this stage (either by not enabling the training controls in Horizon reference data or when we set up users, setting their training dates to the 2018/19 dates for the compliance test).
5. This would give branches chance to get used to the POID and RUID method of operation, but you do not have the risk of either locking out 30% users on each test or have to expend resources in NBSC/HRSC administering training extensions. I think you would as a counterpart to this approach have to have a communications and intervention strategy which tries to build that cultural change around regulatory compliance tests and the importance of them. Essentially the line would be you are now on the Smart ID journey,

- the first part is data capture and POID and the importance of registering new assistants etc., but the next stage (i.e. training controls) is coming and you need to be ready.
6. Given pressure from FS/POMs the FS test in January may need to be the exception to the no training controls rule, but this means you only need to worry about that one test from a heavy intervention perspective, but I think this could be pitched to branches in the right way as the consequence of operating in highly regulated environment and also as a signpost to when full training controls are in force later down the line. This should meet the requirement from FS/POMS.
 7. Full training controls for all regulatory training modules should only be put in place after the 'self-serve' training functionality has been implemented and the requisite evidence of cultural shift is visible.
 8. Little to no monitoring of the use of the RUID and instead focus Branch Standards resources on getting old HUID's removed from the system such when you do turn on training controls you only have POID linked HUIDs being used in every branch.
 9. HR resources would be freed up from manually maintaining training data and should be switched to early life support both before and after the point of migration onto Smart ID, in addition to contacting branches in the lead up training controls being turned on to ensure they are aware of the consequences if people do not do their training and also practical guidance around people who are on holiday during tests, relief Postmasters etc.
 10. If SF timescales drift out to the right, this approach would allow you to potentially rollout to more than 500 branches with current manual processes without having to draft in substantially more resource in HR, as they would not need to maintain the training records manually.

It might be that none of these are practical ultimately, but I thought it might be useful to try and sketch out an alternative which may meet the requirements of FS, POMS and Network, give branches more time to adjust and effect some degree of cultural change that has always been a necessary counterpart to the EUM technical solution.

Regards

Shaun



Shaun Turner
Product Owner
Enhanced User Management Programme

shaun.turner@GRO