

Operational Readiness

Opportunity Self-Assessment

	Innocence		Excellence
1	Informal or formal project delivery methodology fails to recognize or incorporate OR requirements into projects.	1 2 3 4 5	OR reqts are embedded into an integrated and formalized project delivery model fully adopted by the organization.
2	Approved projects are managed by reducing scope to maintain initial budget "at all costs" & difficult to terminate.	1 2 3 4 5	Business case updated by major milestone confirming project "go/no-go" economics & strategic importance.
3	Executive Sponsor & Board fail to recognize the risks associated with a project not being operationally ready.	1 2 3 4 5	Risks & consequences recognize for projects not able to ramp-up to name plate production in a safe & predictable manner.
4	OR funding not sought/obtained resulting in inadequate (\$, time, ppl.) resources to ID or complete project OR reqts.	1 2 3 4 5	Resources (\$, time, ppl) secured in early phases of a project to investigate & identify required OR "scopes of work".
5	Executive team believes site personal can or will address OR requirements after commissioning of the plant/process.	1 2 3 4 5	OR specialists hired early in the project planning phase to define OR requirements & WBS by functional area.
6	Project mandate, approach, and scope are focused on delivering a product rather than a business solution.	1 2 3 4 5	External stakeholders (community, vendors, regulatory, customer) OR reqts identified and documented requirements.
7	Project mandate, approach, and scope incorporates and addresses core and supporting services OR requirements.	1 2 3 4 5	Internal stakeholder reqts ID & documented (ops, mtce, EHS, finance, supply chain, information & technology, legal).
8	Comprehensive stakeholder analysis not completed resulting in increased project unknown risks.	1 2 3 4 5	All ID & documented OR reqts properly scoped, budgeted, and scheduled by functional sub-group.
9	OR project requirements "off-loaded" to client from EPCM to support original/updated business case.	1 2 3 4 5	OR functional sub-group plans integrated into master plan to resolve conflicts ensuring overall schedule integrity.
10	Executives fail to clearly understanding the effort & risk with assuming responsibility for EPCM OR "out of scope" work.	1 2 3 4 5	Executives recognize the myth that site personnel have capacity to complete OR requirements after commissioning.
11	OR team treated as a "token" exercise due to reporting structure and/or lack of integration into project team.	1 2 3 4 5	OR Team provides value with value added engineering reviews & documenting SOP's procedures by function.
12	A lack of communication and formal method to manage change results in unintended negative project outcomes.	1 2 3 4 5	Management of Change process formalized, documented and followed by the project team.
13	Organization is reactive to hiring, on-boarding, training and accommodating (PC, office, camp bed) personnel.	1 2 3 4 5	Future organizational structure, function & strength defined with documented SOP's and training.
14	Inadequate on-boarding and training results in new hires being disillusioned, isolated, with high turn-over.	1 2 3 4 5	Training materials developed and delivered to functional area (Ops, Mtce., Supply Chain, HSE, Finance).
15	"Bottom Up" Mgt. controls reactively developed in isolation by functional silo using a "just in time" approach.	1 2 3 4 5	Integrated management controls and reporting functions developed and fully implemented during commissioning.
16	Lack of an integrated OR ramp-up plan results in sub-optimal silo thinking, work processes and reactive mgt.	1 2 3 4 5	An integrated functional plan by area ensures an optimal safe and predictable ramp-up to name plate production.
17	Conflicting reqts due to silo thinking and lack of integration creates sub-optimal end to end business processes.	1 2 3 4 5	An integrated stakeholder plan is executed - Community, Haz Ops, Supply Chain, Commissioning, HSE, Quality.
18	Firefighting is the norm as "root cause" analysis fails to address "systemic" related operating system weaknesses.	1 2 3 4 5	Variances to plan are identified as lessons learned and addressed as part of a continuous improvement process.
19	Transferring completed project data is not viewed as critical to the business resulting in an ad-hoc manual processes.	1 2 3 4 5	Electronic method established to transfer project data (drawings, as built, vendor supplier data,) to owners team.
20	No plan established to manage transfer of design or as-built drawings, OEM/ supplier data from project to owner.	1 2 3 4 5	Technology in place to manage electronic transfer of project data into CMMS, ERP, and other systems.

Add-up the total score of your self-assessment (circled scores).

If you scored; 81 - 100 Congratulations. You are an effectively managing your operational readiness needs.

61 - 80 - Multiple areas of opportunity for Operational Readiness improvement exist.

41 - 60 - Significant OR projects requirements have been identified increasing the risk to a successful project.

20 - 40 - Substantial project and business risk is being assumed due to a lack of operational readiness.