

De : [Gleb Dubovets](#)
À : [Foldes-Busque, Caroline](#)
Cc : [Malenfant, Karl](#); [Gagné, Martine \(Ext\)](#); [Michel Dumas](#); [Cloutier, Sylvain](#)
Objet : RE: ressources clé manquantes
Date : 4 février 2020 17:21:24

Caroline,

As I suggested, let's meet, review all the staffing gaps and align on who we really need. Suggest to do it in a balanced fashion - with both SAAQ and Alliance gaps to be discussed.

As you noted in you email, we are making progress and do what we can to identify, interview and onboard proper candidates. We are definitely not ignoring the program demand - hope, it is clear.

Martine, could you prepare a list of open Alliance positions and progress status by tomorrow?

-----Translated for your convenience-----

Comme je l'ai suggéré, rencontrons-nous, examinons toutes les lacunes en matière de dotation et alignons-nous sur qui nous avons vraiment besoin. Suggérez de le faire de façon équilibrée - avec les lacunes de la SAAQ et de l'Alliance à discuter.

Comme vous l'avez indiqué dans votre e-mail, nous progressons et faisons ce que nous pouvons pour identifier, interviewer et intégrer les candidats appropriés. Nous n'ignorons certainement pas la demande du programme - espérons, c'est clair.

Martine, pourriez-vous préparer une liste des positions ouvertes de l'Alliance et l'état d'avancement d'ici demain?

Thanks

Gleb Dubovets
VP and Partner, IBM Global Business Services
Enterprise Applications, SAP Practice
Mobile: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

From: "Foldes-Busque, Caroline" [REDACTED]
To: Gleb Dubovets [REDACTED]
Cc: "Malenfant, Karl" [REDACTED], "Gagné, Martine (Ext)" [REDACTED], Michel Dumas [REDACTED], "Cloutier, Sylvain" [REDACTED]
Date: 02/04/2020 04:38 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: ressources clé manquantes

Bonjour Gleb,

Merci de tes précisions.

Quant aux ressources, je suis heureuse de confirmer que nous avons accepté votre candidate pour le remplacement de Martin Chouinard. J'attends sa date d'entrée en fonction. J'ai aussi 2 plages de réserver cette semaine pour des entrevues avec des candidats team lead CST et/ou CSP. J'attends les CV et les confirmations mais c'est de bon augure. Toutefois, le diagnostic en cours par le swat team sur le modèle de données démontre qu'on a des enjeux qui découlent d'un manque de vue intégré et de leadership quant à l'architecture de données. Il nous apparaît critique à la poursuite du projet qu'un architecte de données senior, qui connaît SAP, rejoigne l'équipe à court terme. Avez-vous fait du progrès sur ce cas ? Puis-je avoir un statut sur les autres cas ? On pourrait en discuter en marge du comité de gestion de demain, mercredi.

Quant à ta proposition de revue des demandes de staffing, Sylvain m'a effectivement proposé, lui aussi, d'organiser des revues fréquentes des demandes de staffing que toi et moi devons analyser. Nous organiserons ces revues à partir de la semaine prochaine.

Merci et bonne fin de journée,

Caroline Foldes-Busque
SAAQ

[Outlook](#) pour iOS

De : Gleb Dubovets [REDACTED]

Envoyé : dimanche, janvier 26, 2020 12:24 p.m.

À : Foldes-Busque, Caroline

Cc : Malenfant, Karl; Gagné, Martine (Ext); Michel Dumas; Cloutier, Sylvain

Objet : Re: ressources clé manquantes

Caroline,

Thank you for highlighting your concerns about one of the causes of CASA delivery problem - the difficulties with staffing/resources. I would like to use this as an opportunity to look at the problem holistically, and address all the major root causes: resources, business knowledge/requirements/rules, solution complexity, and execution.

Resources:

1. I acknowledge the challenges with staffing the positions you mentioned although we should take into account how we got here. The new CASA organizational structure was agreed upon only in November, formally re-establishing the 3-in-a-box model disbanded earlier in 2019. Both SAAQ and Alliance have been struggling to find proper resources for key roles, especially the leadership ones. In some cases, on both sides, we are left with people available, even if they are not perfect candidates.
2. To address some of your specific concerns:
 1. PMO: We had agreed last summer that Stéphane will temporarily serve as a joint PMO before we complete the re-plan - it is still the case although Alliance is aggressively looking for recruiting a new PMO lead. A couple of good candidates are in the second round of interviews.
 2. CST: We also agreed that Renaud will temporarily help with CST. Unfortunately, a couple of weeks ago, he decided to leave, creating an unexpected gap. We are in process of interviewing new candidates.
3. With the Data Model SWAT making good progress, I am not convinced that adding Data Architect

new to the solution is the right thing to do. Same is true about [REDACTED] - with Veronique and Peter managing delivery, I don't think we need another lead. We are working with OT on proper solution architecture coverage though.

3. One important point about our staffing situation. In the current market, we need to be practical in our staffing approach and risk management. You and I discussed staffing priorities and agreed that we have a bit more breathing room in cases of CST (with Guy being a strong leader) and Change (where we are quite early in delivery cycle). There will be situations when we need manage gaps by leveraging existing resources, e.g. Mario was covering for CSV team for some time.. Also, not all the gaps are equally critical.

4. Having said that, I want to assure you that we are actively working on searching for the candidates and aggressively recruiting when needed, sometimes breaking internal IBM hiring limitations like in case with Alec. We currently have a few very promising candidates for open positions and planning to close the key gaps rapidly.

5. One more thing. I would strongly recommend to improve collaboration and visibility of the process - establish weekly review of the program staffing, SAAQ and Alliance, where we can assess the demand, candidates, progress and make collective decisions about priorities and alternatives.

Business Knowledge/Requirements/Rules

1. I believe, this issue is the critical one. Based on the team feedback, majority of the RICEFW don't have complete business requirements (I will use this general term to describe any business content and its understanding by the SAAQ team members required to design/build/test/accept the solution).

Obviously, this causes multiple problems:

1. Inability to start design & build right away based on our new agile delivery model. The teams have been spending somewhere between 1 and to 3 weeks (which is the entire Iteration 1) to collect and understand business requirements.

2. Even when solution is in progress, quite often new, very sizable and complex additions were brought in after our SAAQ colleagues had collected and learned more about the business needs. And this is not just a 'normal' discoveries during testing, minor corrections, forgotten things, etc. The additions are very significant, causing major redesign and delays.

3. As SAAQ leads stated in our discussions about inability to complete RICEFW, they don't know if what they delivered is the final version. As the Claudia said, the teams can't commit more than 75% completion because they know that significant additions and changes will come in later - they just don't know which and when.

2. If we look at our 2019 results, it is very clear that when the solution design is done, our development team delivers the goods - we were up to 70 objects developed in November, with 40-47 routinely delivered in summer time. The fact that we had 274 objects developed, tested and marked as complete, but only 116 agreed as really 'done' points to the same problem - no Definition of Done because the teams don't know what business requirements they are delivering

3. As I requested before the holidays, we do need to get a documented evidence of business requirements/rules for each RICEFW in scope. Back in August we agreed how business rules should be documented. Based on my information, this agreement is not honored, and the master list is not being maintained. We must have requirements which drive specific RICEFW before we go to the solution sessions. Without that, we can't size the RICEFW, plan, commit to completion dates, deliver with required velocity and confidence

4. If for some reasons we can't provide the business requirements/rules timely, if the team is unable to define up-front what we deliver and by when, we have a very narrow path forward:

1. Prioritize and focus only on those solutions where the requirements are clear, delivery can be predictable and the team can commit to specific timeline. It means, potentially, a new delivery sequence, with temporary architectural solutions between releases.

2. In parallel, launch a dedicated effort to complete business requirements for all the solution components, standardize and normalize the way the business requirements are captured as well as the use of tools such as BRF+.

3. Based on the remaining RICEFW scope, we should aim for delivering only the most critical functionality by December 2021. There is a couple of options for delivery. Option 1 is basically a 'vertical' split and sequencing of the solution - with certain functionality staying in legacy longer and being replaced only when we ready. Option 2 is a 'horizontal' split - with the end to end processes still being delivered in December 2021 but the scope reduced to only must have feature, followed by enhancement release(s)

after that.

Complexity

1. The L2 is a custom software development project, with very limited use of standard SAP. This impacts not only RICEFW complexity but the architecture, the choice of technologies and the team ability to design and build at a normal SAP implementation speed. We are quite often in uncharted waters, building first of a kind solutions. As far as I know, the initial assumption was to have 50% requirements coverage by SAP functionality - the actual numbers quite different.
2. It is what it is, but - we can still help the team and reduce the overall delivery risks by better managing scope. Unfortunately, we keep adding new scope. Most of it is driven by genuine business needs (Taxi) and strategies (Click Secure vs. new solutions). I appreciate the needs but we can not absorb any more scope - it adds not only volume but also complexity and risk of rework.
3. I believe we need to start looking into our solution to separate and prioritize the 'must have' from the 'nice to have'. It is required for the delivery sequencing and also from complexity reduction perspective. When the teams size the RICEFW and define increments, they need to prioritize the increments. Lower priority increments will need to be deferred till the enhancement release(s) after December 2021.

Execution

1. This one is a very important and, of course, connected to the rest. Regardless, 'what' we decide to deliver, the 'how', the ways of working will define our ability to succeed. Unfortunately, the team is still not at the execution level it can and should be.
2. I truly believe the new delivery model is right. It allows us to fix major execution problems - lack of ownership, disconnect between business, functional and development, extreme number of hand-offs, communication and accountability issues. The challenge is to fully implement and use it consistently and continuously. Here are the steps we need to take urgently:
 1. Complete restructuring of the teams into trios - 3-5 owners of the RICEFW
 2. Manage alleged resource shortage based on new structure and work allocation, not just adding new bodies to the dysfunctional teams.
 3. Enforce proper RICEFW sizing and cycle planning. Within a cycle for the N3 processes in scope, the teams should deliver complete products (RICEFW or configuration), not just increments of the solution. 12 weeks cycle is enough time to deliver that. We need to make necessary adjustments to BRP. Of course, as discussed above, lacking business requirements/rules will make all this very problematic.
 4. Establish and implement simple but effective metrics and status reporting at each level - from trio up to the governance meeting. Right now, we are still flying blind. PMO performance needs to improve - currently it is very mechanical, slow, disconnected from the team and delivery content.
 5. Establish better integration between Tribes and Squads. They are still disconnected and finger pointing to each other. When RICEFW is assigned to trio, the tribe is responsible for the overall product delivery but the appropriate functional and development chapter leads must ensure their parts of the solution is delivered on time, aligned with the architecture and quality.
 6. Radically change the focus of team conversation at each level - from the governance meeting down to the trios. Most of our governance meeting conversations right now are very descriptive, just telling the stories about the past (last week). It should become a conversation for actions - with clear requests, commitments, conditions of satisfactions, actions and acceptance. The leadership also should drive it to the lowest, individual level - to ensure commitments aligned with the program/tribe/squad/trio goals, and hold people accountable, This change is critical for achieving a real breakthrough in the team performance.

Suggest to discuss further with the leadership team and take actions. Sorry for the long email.

Best Regards,

Gleb Dubovets
VP and Partner, IBM Global Business Services
Enterprise Applications, SAP Practice

Mobile: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

From: "Foldes-Busque, Caroline" [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED] "Gagné, Martine (Ext)"
[REDACTED] Michel Dumas
Cc: "Malenfant, Karl" [REDACTED] "Cloutier, Sylvain"
[REDACTED]
Date: 01/24/2020 12:15 PM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] ressources clé manquantes

Bonjour,

L'embauche de ressources demeure un défi constant dans ce projet. Toutefois certains délais ou retard dans l'embauche de ressources clé ont plus d'impacts sur le bon déroulement du projet. Vous n'êtes pas sans savoir que les postes clé suivants restent à combler :

- Le **leader adjoint CSP**, poste que nous avons convenu de remplacer en novembre 2019
- Le **leader adjoint CST**, poste vacant depuis 14 juin 2019
 - Renaud Paradis palliait ces 2 rôles depuis le début juillet 2019. Son départ vient d'être annoncé et prendra effet en date du 31 janvier prochain, ce qui augmente nos enjeux pour les 2 postes mentionnés
- Le **leader gestion du changement**, à remplacer depuis le départ de Ruth, en décembre 2018. Nous avons certes depuis fait une tentative avec Benoit Hardy-Vallée mais nous avons fait le constat, conjointement, que Benoit devrait jouer un rôle d'aviseur mais ne pouvait pas jouer un rôle de leader en livraison. Par ailleurs, sa faible disponibilité (1 jr / semaine à Québec) ne donne pas tout le soutien nécessaire pour assurer fonctionnement efficace de cette équipe et la livraison des livrables requis dans les délais.
- Le leader adjoint au Bureau de programme, poste laissé vacant suite au départ de Mario Rodier le 15 mars 2019
- Un **chef de projet pour le volet relations avec partenaires**, dans l'équipe gestion du changement. Ce poste a été laissé vacant depuis le départ, convenu, de M. Chouinard en 7 novembre 2019. Les activités qu'il gère sont critiques à la livraison et au déploiement du projet avec nos très nombreux partenaires. Faute d'un suivi adéquat, certaines activités clé de ce début d'année risquent de glisser et ajoute de la pression sur l'équipe gestion du changement.
- Un **architecte senior Open text**, suite au départ de Sonia De Sousa, en décembre 2019, nous avons convenu d'investir d'abord dans l'expertise technique .
- Un **architecte de données sénior**, les nombreux enjeux démontrant la non stabilité du modèle de données démontrent à eux seul le besoin de ce profil. Avec le plan d'actions convenu qui doit être exécuté au cycle 6, il est urgent de pouvoir intégrer ce profil à l'équipe.
- 3 conseillers en gestion du changement suite à des départs entre le 23 septembre et le 23 déc 2019.

Il y en a d'autres, bien sûr mais dont l'impact est moins criant dans l'immédiat. Ces cas ne sont pas exhaustifs mais il y a certainement 1 expert **GRC** (vacant depuis le 20 décembre 19) et sécurité (laissé vacant et 2 ressources pour soutenir **GRU8**, etc.

Notre capacité à gérer la livraison en partenariat est mise à risque par ces absences et ajoute une pression considérable sur les leaders de la SAAQ qui sont en apprentissage et qui devaient être coachés pour mener à bien ce projet. Comme discuté, il est requis de remettre en points de suivi au scrum hebdo avec Karl et Michel, nos enjeux et les plans d'actions que vous avez mis en place pour ces cas et les autres se présenteront. Je vous rappelle du même coup que les candidats pour les postes de leader adjoint doivent être nécessairement interviewés par leur vis-à-vis SAAQ et être approuvés formellement avant leur entrée en fonction.

Merci et bonne fin de journée,

Caroline Foldes-Busque

Leader Livraison 2

Carrefour des services d'affaires (CASA)

Société de l'assurance automobile du Québec | 333, Boul. Jean-Lesage, Québec (Québec), G1K 8J6

tél : [REDACTED]

cell : [REDACTED]

courriel : [REDACTED]

De : [Gleb Dubovets](#)
À : [Foldes-Busque, Caroline](#)
Objet : Re: TR: Inventaire des trios
Date : 6 février 2020 08:22:39

OK, it's a start, although a not very encouraging one...It does not show they have a clear plan for C6.

Not sure why it is so difficult for them to take their teams and assign RICEFW to the existing resources using 3 in a Box approach / trios. It looks like they are struggling to organize the team, do a RICEFW sizing (number of increments and iterations required) and allocate resources. How can we help them?

One more thing - we have 80+ RICEFW to go and in this iteration they are planning to finish only 20-25. We need to understand what is the situation with the rest - what needs to be done to complete the remaining RICEFW. I think Tribe Leads, Development and Functional Leads should provide an answer to this question by Monday governance meeting.

Regards

Gleb Dubovets
VP and Partner, IBM Global Business Services
Enterprise Applications, SAP Practice
Mobile: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

From: "Foldes-Busque, Caroline" [REDACTED]
To: Gleb Dubovets [REDACTED]
Date: 02/05/2020 11:47 AM
Subject: [EXTERNAL] TR: Inventaire des trios

What we got from the tribes

Caroline Foldes-Busque

Leader Livraison 2

Carrefour des services d'affaires (CASA)

Société de l'assurance automobile du Québec | 333, Boul. Jean-Lesage, Québec (Québec), G1K 8J6

tél : [REDACTED]

cell : [REDACTED]

courriel : [REDACTED]

De : Rouleau, Anick [REDACTED]

Envoyé : 4 février 2020 16:34

À : Foldes-Busque, Caroline [REDACTED]

Cc : Cloutier, Sylvain [REDACTED] Marcotte, Christian

[REDACTED]

Objet : Inventaire des trios

Bonjour Caroline,

Tu trouveras en pièce jointe le fichier de l'INVENTAIRE consolidé des trios pour les 5 tribus. L'onglet « Notes » contient des compléments d'informations fournies par les tribus CSP et CSV.

J'ai fait un topo à Christian. Je suis également disponible si tu as des questions.

Bonne fin de journée.

Anick[attachment "Inventaire des trios (consolidé).xlsx" deleted by Gleb Dubovets/Piscataway/IBM]