Martin Kerr | Peter Kerr

Organisational Change Management (OCM) for Enterprise Asset Management (EAM)

Business Case to Business As Usual

ISBN: 978-0-9945459-2-3

Cover Art by Illume Graphics

Copyright, Permissions and Disclaimer

Organisational Change Management (OCM) for Enterprise Asset Management (EAM)

Copyright © 2026 Martin Kerr and Peter Kerr. All rights reserved.

ISBN: 978-0-9945459-2-3

Published by:
Structured Change Pty Ltd
ABN 38 608 945 446

First published: July 2026

Copyright and Permissions

The authors encourage the practical application and sharing of the concepts, frameworks, models, templates, and ideas presented in this book.

Readers are welcome to reference, quote, reproduce, copy, adapt, or incorporate material from this publication into their own organisational documents, presentations, training materials, academic work, or business practices, provided appropriate acknowledgement is given to the original source, and provided such use does not imply endorsement by the authors or Structured Change Pty Ltd.

When reproducing or adapting material from this book, the following attribution (or an equivalent citation) should be included:

Kerr, M. & Kerr, P. (2026). Organisational Change Management (OCM) for Enterprise Asset Management (EAM). Structured Change Pty Ltd.

This publication is intended to serve not only as a book to be read sequentially, but also as a practical guide that readers may revisit throughout the lifecycle of Enterprise Asset Management and organisational change initiatives.

"No part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in a manner that misrepresents the original work, authorship, or intent of the publication, or in a way that implies endorsement by the authors or Structured Change Pty Ltd without prior written permission."

Professional Disclaimer

The guidance, observations, frameworks, methodologies, examples, and opinions presented in this publication are based on the authors' professional experience and are intended for educational, informational, and professional development purposes only.

Every organisation operates within its own unique strategic, operational, regulatory, cultural, commercial, and technical context. As a result, readers are expected to exercise their own professional judgement when applying or adapting any concepts contained within this publication.

The authors recognise that readers may interpret, modify, or implement the material in ways that differ from the original intent. Responsibility for the application of any information contained in this book rests solely with the individual or organisation implementing it.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, the authors, Martin Kerr and Peter Kerr, together with Structured Change Pty Ltd, accept no responsibility or liability for any loss, damage, cost, claim, operational outcome, business decision, project result, or other consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use, interpretation, adaptation, or application of the material contained within this publication.

Nothing in this publication constitutes legal, financial, engineering, safety, regulatory, or professional advice. Readers should obtain appropriate independent advice where required.

A Practical Resource

This book has been written as a practitioner reference rather than a prescriptive standard. There is no single correct approach to organisational change or Enterprise Asset Management transformation. Instead, the intent is to provide practical guidance, stimulate informed discussion, and help practitioners make better decisions within their own organisational context.

If this book contributes to improved outcomes, more informed decision-making, or better conversations about change, the authors ask only that its source is acknowledged so others may also benefit from the original work.

Introduction

Purpose

Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) has evolved far beyond a maintenance management system. Today, it is a critical business capability that enables organisations to make informed decisions, optimise asset performance, manage risk, improve service delivery and realise greater value from their assets throughout their lifecycle. Yet despite significant investment in technology, many EAM implementations fail to achieve their intended business outcomes, not because the software falls short, but because organisations underestimate the scale of change required to successfully embed new ways of working.

The purpose of this book is to provide a practical, end-to-end guide to implementing Enterprise Asset Management through the lens of Organisational Change Management (OCM). It follows the complete transformation journey, from developing the initial business case and establishing organisational readiness, through solution design, data and information maturity, business process transformation, testing, training, deployment, hypercare and ultimately transitioning to sustainable business-as-usual operations. Throughout the book, equal emphasis is placed on technology, governance, people and organisational capability, recognising that lasting success depends on aligning all four.

A central theme of this book is the distinction between "**Organisational Change Management (OCM)**" and the "**Management of Change (MoC)**". While both disciplines are essential to successful transformation, they serve different purposes. Management of Change provides the governance and control required to manage changes safely and effectively, whereas Organisational Change Management prepares people, leaders and organisations to understand, adopt and sustain those changes. Understanding how these disciplines complement one another is fundamental to delivering successful EAM programmes that continue to create value long after project completion.

Whether you are an executive sponsor, programme manager, project manager, asset manager, maintenance professional, system integrator, business analyst, change practitioner or operational leader, this book is intended to bridge the gap between technology implementation and organisational transformation. Its purpose is not simply to help organisations implement an EAM system, but to enable them to build the governance, capability, culture and ways of working required to maximise the value of their investment. Ultimately, this book aims to become the practical guide for delivering Enterprise Asset Management programmes that are not only technically successful but also operationally adopted, organisationally embedded, and sustainably realised.

Our Intent

Above all, this book exists because we believe **Enterprise Asset Management (EAM)** projects deserve more than successful software implementations. They deserve successful organisational transformations.

If these pages feel more like a conversation than a textbook, that is entirely intentional.

They are the product of years of discussions, debates, reflections, and shared experiences between two practitioners who have spent their careers helping organisations navigate change.

This is our story, informed by the stories of the many organisations and people we have had the privilege to work alongside.

With the assistance of AI, we have found a way to capture those experiences, organise them into a practical guide and share them with others.

Why…Because we are practitioners, not authors.

If this book helps even one organisation avoid common pitfalls, deliver lasting capability and realise the full value of its Enterprise Asset Management investment, then every one of those conversations will have been worthwhile.

Who This Book Is For

Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) projects are rarely limited by technology. More often than not, they succeed or fail because of people, decisions, leadership, data, governance, and an organisation's ability to adapt to change. This book was written for those responsible for navigating that complexity.

Whether you are implementing a new Enterprise Asset Management system, modernising business processes, improving asset management capability, or leading organisational transformation, this book is designed to help you understand both **Organisational Change Management (OCM)** and the **Management of Change (MoC)** as complementary disciplines. One focuses on preparing people and organisations to adopt new ways of working; the other ensures that changes are introduced safely, systematically, and sustainably. Together they create the conditions for lasting success.

This is not an academic textbook. It is a practical guide built from decades of experience across asset-intensive industries, drawing on both successful transformations and projects that taught difficult lessons. Throughout the book, we share observations, techniques, questions to ask, common pitfalls, and practical insights that can be applied regardless of the software vendor, implementation methodology, or industry sector.

Executive Sponsors and Senior Leaders

Executives, directors and senior managers responsible for sponsoring digital transformation, asset management improvement, or enterprise technology investments will gain an understanding of the organisational commitments required beyond approving budgets and selecting software. The book demonstrates why visible leadership, governance, strategic alignment and sustained sponsorship are often the deciding factors between success and failure.

Systems Integrator (SI)

If you are a Systems Integrator, this book is intended to help you appreciate that successful Enterprise Asset Management implementations are not achieved solely through configuring software, delivering technical milestones, or completing project scope. Long-term success depends on how effectively people, processes, information, governance, and technology transition together.

Asset Management Leaders

Asset managers, maintenance managers, reliability leaders, operations managers and engineering leaders will find practical guidance on aligning technology with the organisation's asset management objectives. The focus remains on realising value from assets rather than simply implementing another enterprise system.

Change Management Professionals

Organisational Change Managers, Change Leads and Transformation Practitioners will find practical approaches tailored specifically to Enterprise Asset Management environments. While many change management principles are universal, EAM implementations introduce unique operational, technical and regulatory challenges that require a different perspective from many traditional corporate transformation programs.

Project Managers and PMOs

Project Managers, Program Managers and Project Management Offices will gain a broader appreciation of the organisational factors that influence project outcomes. Successful delivery extends beyond scope, schedule and budget to include adoption, operational readiness, governance and long-term business ownership.

Business Analysts and Process Professionals

Business Analysts, Process Analysts and Business Architects will discover why understanding how work actually happens is just as important as documenting how it is supposed to happen. The book explores requirements, operating models, business rules, decision ownership and the realities of designing future ways of working.

Solution Architects, Consultants and System Integrators

Technical consultants, functional consultants, solution architects and implementation partners will better understand the organisational environment into which their solutions are introduced. Technical excellence alone does not guarantee successful adoption; understanding organisational dynamics is equally important.

Data, Information and Digital Professionals

Data managers, information managers, configuration specialists, integration specialists, and digital transformation teams will gain insight into the critical relationship among trusted information, governance, business processes, and user confidence. High-quality data is not simply a technical deliverable; it is fundamental to organisational trust.

Operational Leaders and Frontline Managers

Supervisors, planners, schedulers, maintenance coordinators and operational leaders are often responsible for embedding new behaviours after project teams have departed. This book provides practical guidance for supporting teams through change, reinforcing new practices and building sustainable capability.

Students and Emerging Professionals

Those beginning careers in Asset Management, Engineering, Enterprise Systems, Organisational Change or Project Delivery will gain a practical understanding of how these disciplines intersect. Rather than viewing projects solely through technical or organisational lenses, readers will develop a systems perspective that recognises the importance of people, process, technology, data and leadership.

This book is written for anyone who believes that successful Enterprise Asset Management is not achieved by simply implementing software. It is achieved when people, processes, information and technology come together to realise value from assets. (Martin & Peter)

Where This Book Began

This is not a book that was written in the traditional sense.

It is the culmination of more than fifty years of combined professional experience, countless projects, difficult conversations, hard-earned lessons and a genuine passion for helping organisations succeed. Over the course of almost a year, we deliberately took the time to look back across our respective careers, reflecting on what we had seen, what we had learned and, perhaps most importantly, what we wished more organisations understood before embarking on major Enterprise Asset Management transformations.

Our careers have followed different paths, yet they have consistently converged around the same purpose. Between us, we have worked in software and application development, designed and delivered bespoke software solutions, implemented Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) and Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) systems, led data and information management initiatives, developed digital solutions and supported organisations through complex operational and organisational change. We have worked as business partners in a software company, collaborated on major transformation programmes and, in more recent years, focused our efforts on Organisational Change Management, supporting organisations across both Asset Management and Information Technology.

How to Use This Book

This book has been written by practitioners, for practitioners.

Although the chapters follow the natural lifecycle of an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) transformation from building the business case through to sustaining Business as Usual (BAU), you do not need to read it from beginning to end. Each chapter has been designed to stand on its own, allowing you to focus on the challenges that matter

most to your organisation today. This approach is consistent with the book's intent, which encourages readers to start wherever their current challenge lies.

Whether you are an executive approving investment, a project manager planning delivery, a change practitioner preparing communications, a business analyst defining requirements, a system integrator configuring software, or an operational leader preparing for go-live, you can use this book as both a learning resource and a practical reference throughout your transformation.

Read It Your Way: You can use this book in several different ways.

If you are new to Enterprise Asset Management or Organisational Change Management, read it from beginning to end. The chapters progressively build an understanding of why successful EAM programmes depend on aligning people, process, technology and data.

If you are already involved in an EAM programme, jump directly to the chapters that relate to your current phase of delivery. For example:

- Developing the Business Case
- Organisational Readiness
- Stakeholder Engagement
- Future Process Design
- Data and Information
- Testing
- Training and Capability
- Go-Live
- Hypercare
- Sustaining Business as Usual

Because each chapter is self-contained, you can quickly access practical guidance without needing to read the entire book first.

Use the Chapter Summaries: At the end of every chapter, you will find three practical reference sections:

- **Organisational Change Management (OCM)** observations highlighting people, leadership, and adoption considerations.
- **Management of Change (MoC)** observations that distinguish governance, control and operational risk from organisational change.
- **Structured Change Framework (SCF)** alignment, showing where each topic fits within the Discover, Define, Design, Deliver and Depart phases.

These summaries are intended to provide a quick reference during projects and help reinforce the distinction between Organisational Change Management and the Management of Change.

Learn From Our Experience: Throughout the book you will occasionally see comments from either *Martin or Peter*.

Comments from Martin are typically oriented towards Organisational Change Management (OCM) and are labelled (Martin).

Comments from Peter are typically from a Management of Change (MoC) perspective and are labelled (Peter).

These are not academic observations. They are practitioner reflections drawn from more than fifty years of combined experience across Enterprise Asset Management, software delivery, organisational transformation and operational improvement. Sometimes we agreed immediately. Sometimes we challenged one another. Those conversations shaped many of the insights contained in this book and, we hope, make the content feel more like a discussion between experienced practitioners than a traditional textbook.

Use It as a Reference Guide: Many readers will return to this book multiple times during an EAM programme.

As your project progresses, different chapters will become relevant:

During your project...	Read...
Building the business case	Business Case, Success Measures, Organisational Readiness
Designing the solution	Stakeholders, Future Operating Model, Business Processes, Data
Preparing for implementation	Leadership, Learning, Business Analysis, Solution Design
Testing and deployment	Testing, Go-Live, Hypercare
After go-live	Benefits Realisation, Continuous Improvement, Business as Usual

Rather than reading the book once, we encourage you to revisit it throughout your transformation journey.

Keep One Question in Mind

Every chapter can be viewed through a single question:

"What must change not just in the technology, but in the organisation for this investment to deliver lasting value?"

If you continually ask that question, you will begin to see that successful Enterprise Asset Management is rarely about software alone. It is about aligning people, process, technology, information, governance and leadership to realise value from assets.

That is the journey this book is intended to support.

Conversations Before Chapters

As we began discussing this book, we quickly realised that the knowledge we wanted to share wasn't neatly contained in documents, presentations, or methodologies. It lived in our experiences. It was found in the projects that succeeded, the projects that

struggled, the decisions we would make differently today and the recurring patterns we had both observed throughout our careers.

Rather than writing the book chapter by chapter from a blank page, we chose a different approach.

Over many months, we interviewed one another. We challenged each other's thinking, debated ideas, revisited projects from decades ago and explored why some organisations embraced change while others resisted it. We recorded hours of conversations, capturing stories, observations, practical examples and lessons learned. Those discussions became the heart and soul of this book.

Many of the ideas in these pages were not born in front of a keyboard. They emerged through conversation, reflection and the sharing of experiences accumulated over decades of working alongside clients, project teams, operational leaders and asset management professionals.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and this Book

Once we had captured those conversations and close to 100 hours of audio recordings, we faced another challenge: how to transform thousands of spoken words, notes, and ideas into a book that was practical, engaging, and easy to read.

This is where Artificial Intelligence became an invaluable collaborator.

AI did not write this book in the sense that it created the ideas, drew the conclusions or replaced our experience. Every principle, story, lesson and opinion in these pages comes from our combined careers and the organisations we have had the privilege to support. The insights are ours; the experiences are real.

What AI provided was something different.

It helped us organise our thoughts, identify common themes, improve structure, refine language and present complex ideas in a way that is accessible to a wider audience. It enabled us to spend more time refining the message than wrestling with the mechanics of writing.

In many ways, the process mirrors one of the book's central messages.

Technology is at its most powerful when it amplifies human capability rather than attempting to replace it.

Artificial Intelligence became another tool in our toolkit, much like an Enterprise Asset Management system. It is an enabler. It can accelerate outcomes, improve consistency and increase productivity, but only when guided by experience, judgement and a clear understanding of the problem being solved.

A Book Written by Practitioners (for anyone)

Neither of us set out to become authors.

We have spent our careers solving problems rather than writing about them. We have worked in software development, enterprise applications, ERP and EAM

implementations, data and information management, organisational transformation and Asset Management. We have worked with executives, engineers, maintainers, operators, planners, project managers, consultants and frontline teams.

Our perspective has always been shaped by practice rather than theory.

This book reflects what we have seen work, what we have seen fail, and the lessons we believe are worth sharing with others embarking on similar journeys. It is grounded in experience rather than in methodology alone, and is written from the perspective of people who have been responsible for delivering outcomes, not simply documenting them.

ISO Management System - Harmonised Structure (HS)

One of the most significant developments in modern management systems has been the formal recognition that change itself must be planned, governed and managed, not simply implemented. This evolution aligns closely with the central theme of this book: organisations do not realise value from new systems, processes or asset management practices unless they deliberately manage the organisational transition required to embed them.

In May 2021, the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) introduced Planning for Change (Clause 6.3) into the Harmonised Structure (HS) that underpins all ISO management system standards. This replaced the previous Annex SL High-Level Structure (HLS) and established a common expectation that organisations should plan changes in a structured, considered and risk-informed manner, regardless of whether they are implementing standards for Asset Management, Quality, Environment, Information Security, Safety or any other management system.

The introduction of Clause 6.3 represents an important shift in thinking. Rather than treating change as an activity occurring outside the management system, ISO now recognises that change is an integral part of maintaining organisational performance, governance and continual improvement.

Planning for Change (ISO Clause 6.3)

Clause 6.3 requires organisations to consider changes in a planned manner by evaluating:

- the purpose of the change;
- the potential consequences;
- the integrity of the management system;
- the availability of resources; and
- the allocation or reallocation of responsibilities and authorities.

These principles are remarkably consistent with both **Organisational Change Management (OCM)** and the **Management of Change (MoC)** disciplines explored throughout this book.

ISO/TS 10020 Organizational Change Management

As practitioners, we never intended to develop a framework that mirrored an international standard. We wanted a practical approach that helped organisations realise lasting value from Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) investments. Looking back, it is encouraging to see how closely years of practical experience align with internationally recognised organisational change management principles.

For us, this reinforces an important lesson:

- Standards describe what organisations should consider.
- Frameworks help practitioners understand how to put those principles into practice.

Throughout this book we have attempted to bridge that gap by combining recognised good practice with the realities of delivering complex organisational change.

When I was the convenor of ISO 55001:2024, we started the formal review in May 2021. (The same month that ISO introduced Planning for Change 6.3). The real eye-opener for me was in August of 2022, when ISO released ISO 10020:2022, and everything started to connect in my mind. For what felt like the first time, change models took a back seat to change governance, which allows organisations to govern their change rather than approach it aspirationally with a bias toward a particular model (or two). (Martin)

The Standard is covered in its own section later in the book.

Structured Change Framework (SCF)

The Structured Change Framework (SCF) is an experience-based practitioner framework developed over more than two decades of Enterprise Asset Management and organisational change delivery.

Following the publication of ISO/TS 10020:2022, we observed significant alignment between many of the principles embodied within the SCF and those described within the international technical specification. This appendix illustrates the alignment points while recognising that the SCF remains an independent practitioner methodology developed from implementation experience.

The SCF is covered in its own section later in the book

About Martin

My journey into organisational change management didn't begin with change management.

It began on the factory floor.

As a young fitter-machinist and maintainer, I was fascinated by how things were made, how engineering problems were solved and why some organisations consistently outperformed others despite having access to the same equipment, technology and resources. I quickly learned that success wasn't determined solely by engineering

excellence. It came from the way people worked together, how decisions were made and whether systems supported or hindered the people expected to use them.

That curiosity shaped the next thirty years of my career.

I moved into software development through automation and early robotics, designing applications that supported engineering, maintenance, asset management and business operations. Writing software taught me to think logically, to understand data structures, workflows and business rules, and to appreciate that technology is simply an enabler. A well-designed application can improve performance, but only if it reflects how people actually work.

As my experience grew, so did the opportunities. I found myself leading projects, implementing enterprise systems, managing business improvement programs, and eventually taking on executive leadership roles, including General Manager, CEO, and Managing Director. Throughout those experiences, I worked across engineering, manufacturing, rail, mining, defence, government, utilities and infrastructure, seeing organisational transformation from almost every possible perspective.

What fascinated me most wasn't the technology. It was the organisations themselves.

Time after time, I watched businesses invest millions of dollars in implementing Enterprise Asset Management systems, ERP platforms, and digital technologies, only to achieve a fraction of the value they expected. Projects were often considered successful because they were delivered on time and within budget, yet operational performance barely changed. People reverted to old habits, spreadsheets reappeared, governance weakened, and leaders questioned why the promised benefits never materialised.

I realised that organisations rarely fail because of poor technology.

They fail because organisational change receives far less attention than technical delivery.

That realisation became the catalyst for everything that followed.

Throughout my career, I have become increasingly passionate about bridging the gap between Asset Management, leadership, governance, and organisational change. Rather than treating change management as a communication exercise or a collection of training activities, I began focusing on how organisations actually build capability, embed new behaviours and create sustainable operational improvement.

This ultimately led me to establish Structured Change in 2015, with a simple philosophy: make complex organisational and asset management concepts practical, understandable and achievable. Our work has never been about implementing frameworks for compliance's sake. It has always been about helping organisations improve performance by connecting strategy with operations, governance with behaviour and leadership with execution.

Along the way, I became deeply involved in the international Asset Management profession, contributing through consulting, training, capability development and professional certification. Those experiences reinforced my belief that Asset

Management and Organisational Change Management are inseparable. One provides the framework for managing assets throughout their lifecycle, while the other enables people to adopt the behaviours, decisions and ways of working needed to bring that framework to life.

One of the most rewarding parts of this journey has been sharing it with my brother, Peter. Although we've often approached problems from different directions, our conversations have continually challenged our thinking. Peter focuses on technical architecture, information flows, data normalisation, and business systems, while I tend to focus on leadership, culture, governance, and organisational capability. We didn't always see eye to eye (that's a typical brother thing), and there were plenty of spirited debates over the years, but those differences became one of our greatest strengths. We learned that meaningful transformation only occurs when both perspectives work together.

Today I remain as passionate about organisational change as I was when I first realised that technology alone never solves organisational problems. Asset Management is not a system. It is not a standard. It is not even a discipline in its own right. It is the collective behaviour of an organisation that enables it to make better decisions every day.

Technology alone never solves organisational problems.

Helping organisations achieve that is what continues to drive me, and it is the reason this book exists.

Relevant credentials:

- Certified Fellow in Asset Management (CFAM)
- Asset Management Chartered Professional (AMCP)
- Certified Asset Management Assessor (CAMA)
- Certified Maintenance and Reliability Professional (CMRP)
- Certified Practising Project Director (CPPD)
- Lead convenor of ISO 55001:2024
- Technical Director of the World Partners in Asset Management (WPiAM)
- Contributor to the Global Forum of Maintenance and Asset Management (GFMAM)
- Microsoft Certified Professional (MCP)
- Certified Trainer (Applying Asset Management)
- Co-Author of Living Asset Management Maturity (2020)
- Author of Organizational Change Management for Asset Management (2025)
- Author of The Solo Move (2026)

About Peter

My pathway into Management of Change did not begin with change management.

It began with a mix of practical and frontline work.

I started an apprenticeship as a fitter. Although I did not complete it, I worked in several very different environments, including customer service at a health fund, a market research print room, lawn mowing, and fast food. None of those roles looked like the beginning of a career in organisational transformation, but each gave me an early understanding of how work is really performed.

I saw that good outcomes depended on more than procedures. They depended on timing, information, practical judgement, reliability and the people doing the work. I also learned that the view from the frontline is often very different from that of those designing the process or making decisions elsewhere.

My career later moved into technology.

I became involved in designing, building and implementing information systems that supported complex business operations. What interested me was not only the software, but how everything connected around it. Systems relied on processes. Processes relied on people and information. Information supported decisions. Decisions needed ownership, accountability and governance.

As my experience grew, I became increasingly involved in project delivery, business analysis, solution design, information management and organisational improvement. I worked across banking, telecommunications, retail, government, infrastructure and asset-intensive environments, often sitting between business teams, operational stakeholders and technical delivery teams.

Much of my work involved translating between those groups. The technology teams understood what the solution could do, while the business understood how the organisation actually operated. My role was bringing those perspectives together to deliver practical outcomes.

Over time, I began to notice a recurring pattern.

Projects could deliver exactly what they promised technically and still leave the organisation struggling. Systems went live, but spreadsheets remained. New processes were bypassed, responsibilities became unclear and old workarounds continued beneath the surface.

The system might have been operating, but the organisation was not yet operating differently.

That distinction shaped the direction of my career.

I became increasingly focused on understanding what needed to be in place for an organisation to move confidently from one operating state to another. This included understanding impacts, assessing readiness, identifying dependencies and helping business leaders understand where operational risks might emerge.

My recent work has reinforced this perspective. Across large enterprise transformation programs, I have worked with operational, business, and technical stakeholders to

understand what is changing, who is affected, what the organisation needs to be ready for, and where transition risks may lie.

Whether the change involved asset information, financial systems, operational technology, enterprise reporting, business processes or governance, I found myself returning to the same questions.

- What is actually changing?
- Who owns the decision?
- What information can be trusted?
- What dependencies exist across people, process, technology and data?
- What controls need to remain in place?
- Is the business genuinely ready to operate differently?

These questions naturally led me towards the Management of Change perspective.

For me, Management of Change is about understanding the full impact of change before it becomes operational. It means recognising the relationships between people, process, technology, information and governance so risks can be managed before they become operational problems.

My experience in Asset Management has reinforced that perspective. For me, Asset Management is not just about physical assets; it is about how people, process, technology, data, information and governance work together to create value. I am less interested in whether a project has finished than whether the organisation can operate, measure and sustain the change long after implementation.

One of the most rewarding parts of my career has been working alongside my brother, Martin.

We share many of the same experiences and interests, but we often view change from different angles. Martin naturally focuses on organisational change, leadership, culture, and how people experience transformation. I tend to focus on systems, information, governance, operational readiness and organisational capability.

We have not always agreed, and our conversations have often challenged both of us. Over time, however, we came to understand that our perspectives are complementary rather than competing.

Together, these perspectives shaped the Structured Change Framework presented in this book and reflect the way we believe successful transformation should be approached.

Today, my professional focus remains helping organisations understand the full impact of change before it becomes operational.

Technology will continue to evolve, but successful organisations are those that can introduce change without losing control of governance, information, decision-making or operational performance. Helping organisations achieve that is what continues to drive me.

Relevant credentials:

- Certified Practitioner in Asset Management (CPAM)
- Certified Asset Management Assessor (CAMA)
- Certified ScrumMaster
- Diploma of Project Management
- Diploma of Business Management
- Microsoft Certified Professional (MCP)
- Contributor to the World Partners in Asset Management
- Contributor to the Global Forum on Maintenance and Asset Management

Part One - Understanding Enterprise Asset Management

Chapter 1 - Why Most EAM Implementations Underperform

Why organisations blame software

When an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM), Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP), or other major business system fails to deliver the expected benefits, the software is often blamed first. It is an easy conclusion to reach. Users become frustrated, processes feel more complicated, productivity appears to decline, and confidence in the implementation quickly erodes. Yet, after working on major transformation programs across government, infrastructure, utilities, defence, manufacturing and private industry, I have found that the software is rarely the primary cause of failure. More often, technology exposes organisational weaknesses that already existed. The system becomes a mirror, revealing inconsistent governance, unclear decision-making, poor data quality, fragmented processes and inadequate organisational change. The software did not create these problems; it simply made them visible.

I remember being part of an application development team. We converted a locally hosted (distributed) defect management system to a centralised view. The business didn't like it because it highlighted how they prioritised their work. They blamed the software, but as we dug deeper, they realised that the harder they pushed back on the solution, the more evident it became that their planning was flawed and introduced risk through bias (Martin)

Software Exposes Existing Process Problems

Many organisations attempt to automate processes that have never been consistently defined or followed. Rather than fixing these issues, the new system highlights them. What appears to be a software problem is often a process problem that has existed for years.

Poor Data Produces Poor Outcomes

An EAM platform depends upon accurate, complete and trusted information. If asset registers are incomplete, master data is inconsistent, or maintenance histories are unreliable, the software can only process the information it receives. Poor decisions are often the result of poor data rather than poor technology.

Unfortunately, when the SI speaks in terms of data, most organisations hear the word data and glaze over. Large EAMs run (and survive) on structured data. We need to spend more time with organisations up front to explain the importance of quality and complete data, and to provide basic language to distinguish between master data and transactional data. I have observed organisations go silent on the topic; the data team assumes they understand, and when go-live comes around, the fingers start pointing. Everyone plays a part in data stewardship. (Martin)

People Were Never Prepared for New Ways of Working

Many implementations focus heavily on configuring the system while investing far less in preparing people to adopt new behaviours. Users are expected to change how they plan work, manage assets, record information, and make decisions, with little understanding of why these changes matter. Resistance is then incorrectly attributed to the software rather than insufficient organisational change management.

Governance Remains Unchanged

A modern EAM system introduces greater transparency and accountability. Organisations that continue to operate with unclear ownership, inconsistent decision-making and competing priorities often find the system difficult because it exposes governance weaknesses. Technology cannot compensate for poor governance.

Greater transparency will expose any remaining gaps in accountability after implementation. Governance arrangements that were adequate in the old operating model may no longer be fit for purpose in the new EAM environment.

Go-live readiness must therefore address more than process and system changes. Stakeholder groups must also understand the new decision rights, accountabilities, escalation paths and governance expectations that will apply from day one. (Peter)

The Business Tries to Replicate the Old System

Rather than embracing improved practices, organisations frequently attempt to configure the new system to behave exactly like the one it replaced. This increases complexity, limits the benefits of modern functionality and creates unnecessary customisation. The result is disappointment, even though the software may have been capable of delivering significantly better outcomes.

Success Is Measured by Go-Live Instead of Business Value

Many projects celebrate successful deployment while overlooking whether the organisation has actually changed. A system that is technically operational but poorly adopted will rarely deliver the expected business benefits. Go-live is the beginning of organisational change, not its conclusion.

Leadership Does Not Reinforce the Change

Employees quickly recognise whether leaders genuinely support new ways of working. If leaders continue to request information outside the system, bypass established workflows, or tolerate inconsistent behaviours, the organisation receives mixed messages. Adoption declines, confidence falls, and the software becomes the scapegoat.

Training Focuses on Buttons Instead of Capability

Teaching people which screens to navigate is not the same as teaching them how to make better decisions. Effective capability development explains why processes exist, how information creates value and how individual roles contribute to organisational objectives. Without this understanding, users often perceive the software as an obstacle rather than an enabler.

Benefits Were Never Clearly Defined

Many organisations begin implementation with ambitious expectations but without a shared understanding of the outcomes they are seeking. If improved reliability, better planning, stronger governance and lifecycle optimisation are not translated into measurable business objectives, disappointment becomes inevitable regardless of the software selected.

Technology Cannot Transform an Organisation on Its Own.

Software is an enabler, not the transformation itself. Sustainable improvement occurs when governance, leadership, culture, information, processes and people evolve together. Technology supports this change but cannot replace it.

The question should rarely be, "Is the software failing us?" Instead, organisations should ask, "What is the software revealing about the way we operate?" Every major implementation provides an opportunity to improve governance, clarify roles, strengthen information quality and develop organisational capability. The organisations that realise the greatest value understand that software is only one component of transformation. Real success comes from aligning people, processes, leadership, data and technology into a coherent operating model. When this happens, the software stops being viewed as the problem and begins delivering the value it was designed to create.

People

Every Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation is ultimately about changing how people work. While organisations invest significant time selecting software, designing processes and migrating data, they often underestimate the scale of behavioural change required to realise the system's intended value.

An EAM platform, on its own, does not improve asset management.

It enables people to make better decisions, follow more consistent processes and work together more effectively. If people are not ready, willing and supported to make those changes, even the most sophisticated solution will underperform. Technology is implemented in months; organisational adoption can take years.

The cliché “an organisation is a system made up of people” is often dismissed. When you consider it against the definition of asset management as per ISO 55000, “The coordinated activity of an organisation to realise value from assets”, it clarifies how to treat people: they provide value to an organisation, as they are organisational assets in their own right. This subtle positioning has helped me align even the toughest stakeholder (Martin)

People Do Not Understand Why the Change Is Happening

Many implementations begin with discussions about software features, project milestones and technical delivery. Employees, however, want to know how the change

will affect their work and why it is necessary. Without a compelling purpose, the implementation becomes another corporate initiative rather than a meaningful improvement.

New Behaviours Are Assumed Rather Than Developed

An EAM implementation changes far more than the system people use. It changes how work is requested, planned, prioritised, approved, executed and recorded. These behaviours require deliberate coaching, reinforcement and leadership. They do not emerge simply because a new application has been deployed.

Leadership Sends Mixed Messages

People quickly observe what leaders actually value. If leaders continue to request spreadsheets, accept work completed outside approved processes, or bypass governance, employees receive conflicting signals. The organisation says one thing while rewarding another.

Change Is Done to People Rather Than With Them

The people who operate and maintain assets possess invaluable operational knowledge. When they are excluded from process design and decision-making, they are less likely to trust the solution or adopt it. Engagement creates ownership, while exclusion creates resistance.

Training Teaches the System but Not the Work

Many training programs focus on navigating screens and completing transactions. Far fewer explain how the new ways of working improve reliability, safety, risk management or lifecycle decision-making. People need to understand the purpose behind the process, not simply the sequence of clicks.

Roles and Responsibilities Remain Unclear

An EAM implementation often introduces new accountabilities for asset ownership, data stewardship, planning, scheduling and decision-making. If these responsibilities are not clearly defined and understood, confusion replaces consistency, and the system's benefits are diluted.

Organisational Culture Resists Standardisation

Many organisations have developed local practices over many years. Standardised workflows can be perceived as reducing autonomy or disregarding local expertise. Without careful change management, standardisation is seen as a loss rather than an opportunity to improve organisational performance.

Change Fatigue Reduces Commitment

Employees rarely experience an EAM implementation in isolation. It often coincides with restructures, new technologies, compliance initiatives and changing operational priorities. Without effective governance to coordinate change, even well-designed implementations struggle to gain sustained attention.

Success Is Measured by System Adoption Instead of Behavioural Adoption

Logging into the system is not the same as embracing new ways of working. True adoption occurs when people consistently use information to make better decisions, collaborate across functions and reinforce agreed governance. Sustainable value is created through behaviour, not usage statistics.

Continuous Reinforcement Is Forgotten

Many organisations treat change management as something that ends at go-live. In reality, go-live marks the beginning of embedding new behaviours. Coaching, leadership reinforcement, performance measures and ongoing communication are essential if new practices are to become business as usual.

Most EAM implementations do not underperform because people are unwilling to change. They underperform because organisations fail to create the conditions that enable people to change successfully. Effective Organisational Change Management provides those conditions by aligning leadership, governance, communication, capability development and operational engagement around a shared purpose. When people understand the reason for change, have confidence in their roles and are supported throughout the journey, technology becomes an enabler rather than an obstacle. The greatest determinant of implementation success is not the software's capability; it is the organisation's ability to adopt, sustain, and continuously improve the behaviours the software was designed to support.

Governance

Governance is one of the least visible yet most influential factors in the success of an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation. Organisations often associate governance with steering committees, approval gates and reporting structures. While these are important, effective governance is much broader. It establishes how decisions are made, who is accountable, how priorities are balanced and how the organisation remains aligned throughout the transformation. Without strong governance, even the best technology, the most capable people and the most comprehensive implementation plans will struggle to deliver sustainable business value. Governance provides the discipline that turns a project into an organisational transformation.

Governance isn't just for the duration of a project. It is considering everything that interacts with the EAM solution, including processes and data. (Martin)

Executive Sponsorship Is Passive Rather Than Active

Many executives endorse an EAM implementation but remain distant from its delivery. Visible sponsorship requires leaders to communicate the purpose of the change, resolve competing priorities, make timely decisions and consistently reinforce the desired outcomes. Without active leadership, governance quickly loses credibility.

Accountability Is Unclear

Successful EAM implementations rely on clearly defined ownership of decisions, processes, data and business outcomes. When responsibilities overlap or remain

ambiguous, decisions are delayed, issues remain unresolved, and accountability becomes diluted. Governance should make ownership unmistakably clear.

Decision-Making Is Too Slow

Large transformation programs generate hundreds of decisions across process, data, configuration, organisational design, and operating models. If governance structures cannot make timely decisions, projects lose momentum, confidence declines, and workarounds begin to emerge.

Projects Compete Instead of Collaborate

Many organisations have multiple transformation initiatives running simultaneously. Without integrated governance, these programs compete for resources, introduce conflicting priorities and create change fatigue across operational teams. Effective governance coordinates change across the enterprise rather than managing projects in isolation.

Governance Focuses on Delivery Instead of Value

Project governance frequently measures milestones, budgets and schedules while giving less attention to business outcomes. A project can be delivered on time and within budget yet fail to improve asset performance, decision-making or organisational capability. Governance should focus equally on value realisation.

Business Decisions Are Deferred to the System Integrator

Implementation partners bring valuable technical expertise, but they should not determine how the organisation operates. Decisions relating to governance, risk appetite, asset management practices and business priorities must remain with the organisation. Outsourcing these decisions often results in solutions that are technically sound but operationally misaligned.

Data Governance Is an Afterthought

Asset information is one of the organisation's most valuable strategic resources. Without clear ownership of data standards, quality, stewardship and ongoing maintenance, confidence in the system declines. Poor data governance inevitably becomes poor business governance.

Data management versus data ownership are different things. It's one thing to change master data, but without understanding the business context of the change, it can impact operations irreversibly. (Martin)

Benefits Are Not Governed

Business cases often identify significant expected benefits, but few organisations establish governance mechanisms to monitor whether those benefits are actually achieved. Without ongoing oversight, benefits become assumptions rather than measurable outcomes.

Governance Ends at Go-Live

Many governance structures dissolve shortly after implementation, once the project is complete. However, embedding new ways of working, improving data quality and maturing organisational capability continue well beyond deployment. Effective governance evolves into operational governance that sustains long-term improvement.

Governance Does Not Reinforce Organisational Change

Governance is not simply about compliance; it shapes behaviour. Performance measures, leadership decisions, reporting, assurance activities and accountability mechanisms all influence how people work. When governance reinforces the desired behaviours, organisational change becomes sustainable. When it does not, old habits quickly return.

Strong (effective) governance does far more than oversee an EAM implementation. It creates clarity, enables timely decisions, balances competing priorities and ensures that technology investments remain focused on delivering organisational value. In my experience, organisations rarely fail because their governance framework was too structured. They fail because governance was fragmented, inconsistent or disconnected from operational reality. Successful implementations are characterised by governance that extends beyond project management into leadership, accountability, data stewardship, benefits realisation and continuous improvement. Ultimately, governance provides the stability that allows people, processes and technology to move together toward a common objective. Without it, even the most capable implementation team will struggle to deliver lasting success.

Culture

Culture is often described as "the way we do things around here," but in the context of an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation, culture is much more than a collection of shared values. It is the behaviours, beliefs, assumptions and unwritten rules that influence how decisions are made and how work gets done every day. An EAM system can introduce new processes, improve visibility and provide better information, but it cannot change culture on its own. If the existing culture does not support collaboration, accountability, disciplined decision-making and continuous improvement, the implementation will struggle to achieve its intended outcomes. Technology changes quickly. Culture changes deliberately, through consistent leadership and sustained organisational effort.

The Organisation Values Familiarity Over Improvement

People naturally gravitate towards ways of working they know and trust. Even when new processes are demonstrably better, many employees prefer familiar routines because they feel safer and require less effort. Without deliberate leadership and reinforcement, old habits quickly overpower new capabilities.

Silos Prevent Enterprise Thinking

Enterprise Asset Management requires decisions that optimise value across the organisation rather than within individual departments. In organisations where teams

protect their own priorities, information and resources, collaboration becomes difficult, and the system is used to support local optimisation rather than enterprise outcomes.

Accountability Is Avoided

Healthy cultures encourage ownership and learning. Less mature cultures encourage blame and defensiveness. When employees fear being criticised for mistakes, they are less likely to report issues accurately, maintain data quality or adopt transparent processes. The result is poor information and poor decision-making.

Short-Term Pressures Override Long-Term Value

Asset Management is inherently a long-term discipline. However, many organisational cultures reward immediate operational outcomes at the expense of lifecycle performance. Maintenance is deferred, data quality is compromised, and governance is bypassed to solve today's problem, often creating much larger problems tomorrow.

Operational Knowledge Is Not Respected

The people closest to the assets often possess the greatest understanding of operational reality. In cultures where frontline experience is overlooked, valuable insights are lost, and solutions become disconnected from the environment in which they must operate. Successful implementations create cultures that actively listen to operational expertise.

I have witnessed this multiple times. This reinforces the false assumption that an EAM is simply a software platform that operations will meld to. While operations are busy keeping things moving, finance makes decisions based on reporting needs and operational insight and knowledge are ignored. This impacts culture, uptake, and the benefits of an EAM. (Martin)

Continuous Improvement Is Replaced by Compliance

Some organisations implement an EAM system to achieve compliance rather than to improve performance. Employees focus on completing mandatory tasks rather than on improving processes to make them safer, more reliable, or more efficient. A culture of compliance rarely produces a culture of excellence.

Change Is Viewed as a Project Rather Than a Way of Working

When employees believe change has an end date, they often wait for the organisation to return to previous behaviours once the project concludes. Sustainable Asset Management requires a culture that sees improvement as continuous rather than temporary.

Trust Between Teams Is Weak

Enterprise Asset Management depends on confidence in shared information, processes, and accountability. Where trust is low, departments develop workarounds, maintain independent records and question the integrity of information produced by others. The result is duplication, inconsistency and reduced organisational performance.

Leaders Reinforce the Wrong Behaviours

Culture follows what leaders consistently reward, tolerate and model. If leaders encourage bypassing processes to achieve short-term results, employees quickly learn that governance is optional. Conversely, when leaders consistently reinforce disciplined decision-making, collaboration and accountability, those behaviours become embedded across the organisation.

Success Is Defined by Activity Rather Than Value

Many organisations celebrate the completion of training, the rollout of software and the closure of project milestones. While these achievements are important, they do not necessarily indicate cultural change. A mature culture measures success through improved decision-making, stronger collaboration, increased organisational capability and better lifecycle outcomes.

Culture is not a soft consideration in an EAM implementation; it is one of the strongest predictors of long-term success. Every decision, every interaction and every leadership behaviour either strengthens or weakens the environment in which Asset Management operates. Organisations that build cultures of trust, accountability, collaboration and continuous learning consistently achieve greater value from their EAM investments than those focused solely on technology. In the end, systems support performance, but culture determines whether that performance can be sustained. An organisation's Asset Management maturity will always be constrained by the maturity of its culture. When culture and technology evolve together, Enterprise Asset Management becomes more than a system implementation; it becomes a fundamental improvement in the way the organisation creates value.

Data

Every Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation depends on one fundamental asset that is often overlooked…data. Organisations invest millions of dollars in software, integration, training and implementation partners, yet frequently underestimate the importance of the information that drives the system. An EAM platform cannot create accurate asset information, establish data ownership or improve decision-making if the underlying data lacks quality, consistency or context. Poor data does not simply affect reports; it influences maintenance decisions, capital investment, risk management, regulatory compliance and operational performance. In reality, an EAM system is only as effective as the information it is entrusted with managing.

Poor Data Is Migrated Instead of Improved

Many organisations assume that data migration is a technical exercise. As a result, inaccurate, duplicate, incomplete and inconsistent information is transferred into the new system. The technical implementation succeeds, but the business inherits the same problems it hoped to eliminate.

Data Ownership Is Unclear

Asset information belongs to the organisation, not the EAM system. Yet many organisations cannot clearly identify who owns asset data, who is responsible for maintaining it or who has the authority to approve changes. Without clear accountability, data quality inevitably deteriorates over time.

Information Standards Do Not Exist

Different business units often describe the same asset in different ways, use inconsistent naming conventions or apply varying levels of detail. Without agreed information standards, reporting becomes unreliable, integration becomes difficult and enterprise-wide decision-making is compromised.

Data Is Collected Without Purpose

Many organisations capture information simply because their systems allow it. Over time, users become burdened with recording data that is never analysed or used. Effective Asset Management begins by asking which decisions need to be made and then identifying the information required to support them.

Data Quality Is Not Governed

Data quality is often treated as a one-time activity during implementation rather than an ongoing organisational capability. Without governance, stewardship, monitoring and continuous improvement, even high-quality data gradually becomes inaccurate as assets change and operations evolve.

Legacy Practices Continue

Employees frequently continue to use spreadsheets, personal databases, and offline records because they lack confidence in the new system or because historical habits persist. These parallel information sources quickly become inconsistent with the EAM platform, creating multiple versions of the truth.

The Relationship Between Data and Decisions Is Poorly Understood

Collecting data is not the objective. Better decisions are. Asset condition information, maintenance history, failure data and lifecycle costs only create value when they influence planning, investment, risk management and operational performance. Without this connection, data becomes an administrative burden rather than a strategic asset.

Integration Creates Inconsistency

Enterprise Asset Management rarely operates in isolation. It exchanges information with finance, procurement, GIS, document management, operational technology and numerous other systems. Poor integration governance leads to conflicting information, duplicated records and reduced confidence in enterprise reporting.

Master Data Receives Little Attention

Master data, including asset hierarchies, locations, equipment classifications, failure codes and work classifications, provides the foundation for meaningful analysis. If

these structures are poorly designed or inconsistently applied, reporting becomes fragmented and benchmarking becomes unreliable.

Data Is Seen as an IT Responsibility

Perhaps the greatest misconception is that data belongs to Information Technology. Technology enables information management, but the business owns the meaning, quality and value of asset information. Data quality is therefore a business responsibility supported by technology, not delegated to it.

Data is one of an organisation's most valuable assets because it enables the effective management of all other assets. Enterprise Asset Management is fundamentally about making informed decisions throughout the asset lifecycle, and informed decisions require trusted information. Organisations that view data as a strategic organisational capability consistently achieve better outcomes than those that treat it as a technical deliverable. Successful EAM implementations establish clear information governance, defined ownership, consistent standards and a culture that values data as a business asset. When people trust the information they use every day, confidence in the system grows, decision-making improves, and the full value of Enterprise Asset Management begins to emerge. Ultimately, organisations do not achieve Asset Management maturity by collecting more data; they achieve it by creating information that enables better decisions.

Process

Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementations are often described as process transformation programs. In reality, they are an opportunity to improve how an organisation consistently delivers value through its ways of working. Too often, organisations focus on documenting processes while overlooking the practices that bring those processes to life. A process describes what should happen, whereas a practice reflects how people consistently apply that process in the real world. An EAM system can enforce workflows and approvals, but it cannot guarantee that people will follow good practices, make sound decisions or collaborate effectively. Sustainable performance is achieved when well-designed processes are supported by mature organisational practices.

Existing Processes Are Automated Instead of Improved

Many organisations configure a new EAM system around existing processes without first asking whether those processes remain fit for purpose. Automating inefficient or outdated processes allows the organisation to perform the wrong activities more efficiently.

Process Is Confused with Practice

A documented process explains the sequence of activities that should occur. A practice reflects the behaviours, judgement, and discipline that people apply when executing it. Two organisations may have identical documented processes, yet achieve vastly different outcomes because their operational practices differ. Mature Asset Management depends on good practices, not just well-written procedures.

Processes Are Designed Without Operational Input

Business processes often look logical on paper but prove difficult to execute in operational environments. When planners, maintainers, operators and supervisors are not involved in process design, workflows frequently become disconnected from the realities of frontline work.

Standardisation Is Resisted

Enterprise Asset Management relies on consistent processes to produce consistent information and reliable decision-making. However, different business units often prefer their own established methods of working. Without effective organisational change management, local practices continue to override enterprise processes, reducing the value of standardisation.

Workflows Dictate Behaviour Instead of Supporting It

An EAM system should support effective business processes rather than becoming the process itself. When organisations allow system workflows to dictate how work is performed without considering operational practicality, people inevitably develop workarounds that undermine governance and data quality.

Processes Are Overly Complex

In an effort to accommodate every possible scenario, organisations sometimes create highly complex approval paths, decision points and administrative requirements. Complexity slows execution, frustrates users and encourages process avoidance. Effective processes should provide sufficient control while remaining practical and easy to follow.

End-to-End Thinking Is Missing

Many implementations optimise individual functional processes, such as maintenance planning, procurement, or inventory management, without considering how they connect across the asset lifecycle. Enterprise Asset Management requires integrated processes that support planning, acquisition, operation, maintenance, renewal and disposal as a single value chain.

Processes Are Not Reinforced After Go-Live

Publishing new procedures and delivering training does not establish new ways of working. Organisations must continually reinforce expected practices through leadership, coaching, governance, performance measures and operational feedback. Without reinforcement, people naturally return to familiar habits.

Process Performance Is Not Measured

Many organisations measure project progress but rarely measure whether their new processes are actually delivering better outcomes. Lead times, planning effectiveness, work quality, data completeness and decision consistency should all be monitored to identify opportunities for continuous improvement.

Continuous Improvement Is Not Embedded

Business processes should evolve as the organisation learns, technologies mature, and operational needs change. Organisations that treat processes as fixed documents often struggle to adapt, while those that embrace continual improvement steadily increase their Asset Management maturity and organisational capability.

Well-designed processes are essential to successful Enterprise Asset Management, but processes alone do not deliver performance. Performance is created through the practices people develop, the behaviours leaders reinforce, and the culture that encourages continuous improvement. Organisations should therefore distinguish between process and practice. A process defines what should happen, while a practice determines how consistently and effectively it actually happens. Enterprise Asset Management succeeds when robust processes are supported by mature operational practices that enable people to make informed decisions, work collaboratively and create value throughout the asset lifecycle. The objective is not simply to implement better processes, but to establish better organisational practices that sustain those processes.

The illusion of technology solving organisational problems

One of the most persistent misconceptions in Enterprise Asset Management is the belief that new technology will solve organisational problems. It is an understandable expectation. Modern EAM platforms are powerful, offering sophisticated workflows, analytics, mobile capability, predictive maintenance, digital twins and artificial intelligence. Vendors showcase impressive demonstrations, implementation partners promise transformational outcomes, and business cases often project significant improvements in efficiency, reliability and asset performance. It is easy to believe that the technology itself will be the catalyst for change.

The reality is very different.

Technology does not change organisations; people do. An EAM system can provide better information, automate workflows and improve visibility, but it cannot create accountability, strengthen leadership, build trust or establish a culture of continuous improvement. These are organisational capabilities that must exist alongside the technology if the investment is to realise its full value. When these capabilities are absent, the software exposes the gaps that have always been there.

In many implementations, organisations unknowingly ask technology to solve problems that have little to do with technology. They expect an EAM system to improve communication between departments that rarely collaborate. They expect workflows to eliminate inconsistent decision-making despite unclear governance. They hope dashboards will improve data quality when no one is accountable for maintaining the information. They assume that standardised processes will automatically change long-established behaviours. In each case, the software becomes the visible solution to what are fundamentally organisational challenges.

Technology also creates the illusion of progress. A project reaches go-live; dashboards begin producing reports, and users log in to the new system. From a project perspective, success appears to have been achieved. Yet beneath the surface, people continue to rely on spreadsheets, bypass approved workflows, maintain local

databases and make decisions based on experience rather than trusted information. The organisation has implemented new technology, but the underlying ways of working remain largely unchanged.

This is why many organisations become disappointed with their EAM investment. The software performs exactly as it was designed, but the organisation continues to operate according to its existing culture, governance and behaviours. Rather than asking why people have not adopted the new ways of working, the technology is blamed for failing to deliver the expected benefits. In reality, the system has revealed that organisational transformation did not occur alongside technical implementation.

Throughout my career, I have found that successful EAM implementations begin by asking a different question. Instead of asking, "What technology do we need?" they ask, "What kind of organisation do we need to become?" That shift fundamentally changes the implementation approach. Technology becomes one component of a broader transformation that includes leadership, governance, organisational change management, capability development, information maturity, process improvement and cultural alignment.

Technology should therefore be viewed as an enabler rather than a solution. It enables better decisions, greater visibility, improved consistency and stronger governance, but only when the organisation is prepared to use it in those ways. Organisations that invest as heavily in their people, leadership, governance and organisational capability as they do in their software consistently achieve far greater returns than those that view technology as the primary agent of change.

The greatest value of an EAM implementation lies not in the software installed. It is the opportunity it provides to rethink how the organisation creates value through its assets. When organisations recognise that technology cannot solve organisational problems on its own, they begin to focus on the real work of transformation: changing behaviours, strengthening decision-making, improving collaboration, and embedding sustainable ways of working. Only then does technology fulfil its true purpose, not by transforming the organisation itself, but by enabling the organisation to transform.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Technology rarely fails on its own; organisations struggle when people are not brought on the journey.	Every major change should be formally assessed for operational, safety and business risk.
Poor adoption often reflects poor engagement rather than poor software.	Governance should ensure configuration decisions are authorised and documented.
Leadership commitment is usually more influential than system functionality.	Existing operating procedures should not change without appropriate review and approval.
Resistance often signals legitimate operational concerns that deserve exploration.	The cumulative impact of multiple small changes can introduce significant operational risk.

Sustainable change requires behavioural reinforcement long after go-live.	Operational integrity must remain intact throughout implementation and transition.
Success is measured by changed ways of working rather than software utilisation alone.	A successful implementation maintains compliance while enabling improved operational performance.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Discover
Also Supports	Define
Why it matters	Understanding why implementations fail creates the evidence needed to define a different approach before solution design begins.

One lesson I have learnt is that organisations rarely fail during implementation; the warning signs are usually visible much earlier.

Governance isn't there, leaders are misaligned, and business units are solving different problems while assuming the software will bring them together. By the time change management begins, many critical organisational decisions have already been made or avoided.

I saw this when a new operating model was introduced as a programme moved from Explore into Design. The change had not adequately considered the programmes already in flight. A controlled pause, supported by a focused gap analysis, would have identified dependencies, protected completed work and allowed only unaffected activities to continue.

If the organisation is not ready to change how it governs decisions, no system will compensate for that. (Peter)

Chapter 2 - What Enterprise Asset Management Really Is

Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) does not exist in isolation. Modern organisations rely on a broad ecosystem of technologies that collectively support the planning, design, construction, operation, maintenance and optimisation of physical assets. Throughout this book we have deliberately focused on Organisational Change Management rather than software implementation, because technology alone does not transform an organisation. It is the way people adopt, integrate and use technology to improve business capability that ultimately determines success.

One of the recurring challenges we have observed throughout our careers is that organisations often confuse the purpose of different enterprise systems. A Computerised Maintenance Management System (CMMS), Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP), Geographic Information System (GIS), Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA), Product Lifecycle Management (PLM), Asset Performance Management (APM), Building Information Modelling (BIM), Digital Twins, Digital Engineering and Asset Information Management all provide valuable capabilities. Yet,

none of them are Enterprise Asset Management systems. Equally, an EAM system cannot be expected to replace the specialist functions performed by these complementary technologies.

From an organisational change perspective, understanding these distinctions is critical. Every technology influences different business functions, stakeholders, and ways of working. Some systems transform engineering practices, others improve financial governance, some provide operational visibility, while others strengthen maintenance execution or enhance decision-making through analytics. Attempting to implement them with a single change strategy ignores the unique behaviours, capabilities and cultural shifts that each requires.

The purpose of the following sections is not to compare software products or technical features. Instead, they explain the business role each capability plays within the broader asset management ecosystem and, more importantly, the organisational change implications of adopting them. By understanding where each technology fits, leaders and change practitioners can better define ownership, establish appropriate governance and focus their change efforts on building business capability rather than simply deploying software.

Perhaps the most important message is this: organisations do not become asset management leaders because they have more technology. They become leaders because they understand how each technology contributes to a common purpose and they help their people work together across organisational boundaries. When technology, information, governance, processes and people are aligned, the EAM system becomes the operational backbone that connects the entire asset lifecycle from concept and design through to operation, optimisation and eventual retirement.

CMMS

One of the earliest misconceptions encountered during an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation is the assumption that an EAM system is simply a larger or more sophisticated Computerised Maintenance Management System (CMMS). While both platforms support maintenance activities, the organisational change required to successfully implement each is fundamentally different.

A CMMS is primarily focused on improving maintenance execution. It helps maintenance teams plan, schedule, record, and analyse maintenance work, typically within the maintenance function's boundaries. As a result, organisational change is often focused on maintenance personnel, supervisors, and planners, with success measured by improvements in work order management, preventive maintenance compliance, and equipment reliability.

An EAM system, however, extends far beyond maintenance. It manages the entire lifecycle of physical assets, from planning and acquisition through operation, maintenance, renewal and disposal. This broader capability means that an EAM implementation affects multiple business functions including operations, engineering, supply chain, procurement, finance, project delivery and executive leadership. The technology itself is only one component of the transformation; the real challenge lies

in changing how these functions collaborate, share information and make asset-related decisions.

From an organisational change management perspective, implementing an EAM system is therefore an enterprise transformation rather than a maintenance system deployment. It requires changes to governance, business processes, roles and responsibilities, decision-making frameworks, data ownership and organisational culture. Success depends not simply on teaching people how to use new software, but on helping them understand why their ways of working must evolve to support a consistent, organisation-wide approach to asset management.

Perhaps the simplest way to distinguish the two is this: a CMMS changes how the maintenance department works, whereas an EAM changes how the organisation manages its assets. Recognising this distinction from the outset significantly influences the scale of change management activities, stakeholder engagement, leadership commitment and the investment required to achieve sustainable business outcomes.

I was a front-line maintainer myself, so I appreciate why the default response to an EAM platform is often, "This is just a more complex and more expensive version of what we had previously". It is important to explain the difference rather than try to "sell" the difference. An EAM is the opportunity to shift maintenance insights further up the process. (Martin)

ERP

Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) and Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) systems are frequently implemented together, yet they serve fundamentally different organisational purposes. While both are enterprise platforms, the nature of the organisational change they drive is significantly different. Understanding this distinction is critical to designing an effective change management strategy.

An ERP system is designed to standardise and integrate core business processes such as finance, procurement, human resources, payroll and supply chain management. Organisational change is therefore centred on improving transactional efficiency, governance and compliance across corporate functions. Success is often measured through financial accuracy, process standardisation, reporting consistency and operational efficiency.

An EAM system, by contrast, is focused on maximising the value, performance and risk profile of physical assets throughout their entire lifecycle. Rather than focusing on business transactions, it supports operational decision-making on asset reliability, maintenance strategies, engineering, fieldwork, inspections, capital renewal, and long-term asset planning. While finance and procurement remain important stakeholders, the primary organisational change occurs where people interact directly with physical assets; whether in the field, in operations, in engineering or in maintenance planning.

From an organisational change management perspective, ERP implementations typically encourage people to follow standardised business processes that improve organisational control. EAM implementations require more than simple adoption: they

ask diverse operational teams to adopt common asset management practices, improve the quality of technical and operational data, and make decisions based on a shared understanding of asset risk, criticality, and lifecycle value. This often challenges long-established local practices, functional silos and informal ways of working that have developed over many years.

The two systems are therefore complementary rather than competing. An ERP manages the organisation's business, while an EAM manages its physical assets. Organisational change for an ERP focuses on consistency of business processes and financial governance; organisational change for an EAM focuses on changing behaviours, decision-making and collaboration to improve asset performance and organisational outcomes. Organisations that recognise these differences are far more likely to invest in the right change activities, ensuring that both systems deliver their intended value rather than simply becoming another piece of enterprise software.

APM

As organisations continue their digital transformation journey, Asset Performance Management (APM) systems are increasingly implemented alongside Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) platforms. Although the two are closely related and often integrated, they are designed to solve different problems and require different forms of organisational change. Confusing the two can lead to unrealistic expectations and poorly targeted change management efforts.

An EAM system provides the operational framework for managing assets throughout their lifecycle. It supports activities such as asset registration, work management, maintenance planning, inventory management, inspections, shutdowns and asset history. Its primary purpose is to establish consistent processes, reliable data and effective governance for managing physical assets across the organisation.

An APM system builds upon this foundation by using condition monitoring, sensor data, predictive analytics, artificial intelligence and risk models to optimise asset performance and reliability. Rather than focusing on executing maintenance activities, an APM system helps determine “when” maintenance should occur, “which” assets require intervention and “why” decisions should be made. It enables organisations to move from reactive or time-based maintenance towards condition-based and predictive maintenance strategies.

From an organisational change management perspective, implementing an EAM system is largely about establishing discipline, consistency and accountability in asset management practices. Implementing an APM system represents a further level of organisational maturity. It requires people to trust data-driven insights, incorporate predictive recommendations into operational planning and shift from experience-based decision-making towards evidence-based asset management. This often demands new analytical capabilities, closer collaboration between engineering, maintenance, operations and data specialists, and a culture that embraces continuous learning and innovation.

The relationship between the two is complementary rather than hierarchical. An EAM system provides the trusted asset information and structured work management

processes that an APM system relies upon. Without accurate asset data, disciplined maintenance practices and robust governance, even the most sophisticated APM solution will struggle to deliver meaningful value. From an organisational change perspective, an EAM implementation creates the operational foundation, while an APM implementation enhances organisational capability by enabling smarter, more informed decisions that improve asset reliability, performance and long-term value.

GIS

For organisations that manage geographically dispersed assets, Geographic (*sometimes referred to as Geospatial*) Information Systems (GIS) and Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) systems are both essential components of the technology landscape. Although they frequently share information and are often integrated, they have fundamentally different purposes and require different approaches to organisational change. Treating one as a substitute for the other inevitably limits the value that both systems can deliver.

A GIS is designed to capture, manage and analyse spatial information. It provides the geographic context for assets, enabling organisations to understand where assets are located, how they relate to one another, and how environmental, demographic, or network factors influence planning and operational decisions. GIS users are typically concerned with mapping, spatial analysis, network modelling, planning and visualisation.

An EAM system, by contrast, focuses on managing the operational lifecycle of those same assets. It records asset history, manages work orders, schedules maintenance, tracks inspections, controls inventory, captures costs and supports decisions that maximise asset performance, reliability and lifecycle value. While GIS answers the question of where an asset is and how it fits within a network, EAM answers the questions of what work is required, when it should occur, who should perform it and how the asset should be managed throughout its life.

From an organisational change management perspective, implementing a GIS often enhances how people visualise and analyse assets, whereas implementing an EAM changes how people plan, execute, and govern asset-related work. The challenge arises when organisations have historically relied on GIS as the primary source of operational asset information. Transitioning to an integrated environment requires clear data ownership, agreement on the system of record for different types of information and a shared understanding of how operational and spatial data complement one another. This frequently involves changing long-established practices, clarifying roles, and fostering greater collaboration among engineering, maintenance, operations, and geospatial teams.

The relationship between GIS and EAM is therefore one of partnership rather than overlap. GIS provides the spatial intelligence that helps organisations understand their asset networks, while EAM provides the operational discipline to manage those assets effectively throughout their lifecycle. Successful organisational change recognises that value is realised not by choosing one system over another, but by enabling people to

work confidently across both, supported by clear governance, integrated data, and shared business processes.

SCADA

Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) systems and Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) systems are both critical to asset-intensive organisations, but they serve distinctly different operational purposes. While they often exchange information and increasingly operate within integrated digital ecosystems, the organisational change associated with each is fundamentally different. Understanding these differences helps organisations avoid treating operational technology and enterprise asset management as interchangeable capabilities.

A SCADA system is designed to monitor and control operational processes in real time. It collects data from field devices such as sensors, programmable logic controllers (PLCs) and remote terminal units (RTUs), enabling operators to supervise equipment, respond to alarms and control industrial processes safely and efficiently. Its primary focus is on maintaining the continuous operation of plants, networks and infrastructure with minimal disruption.

An EAM system, by contrast, is concerned with the long-term management of the physical assets that support those operations. It plans and records maintenance activities, manages inspections, schedules work, tracks asset history, controls spare parts and provides the information needed to optimise asset reliability, performance and lifecycle cost. While SCADA is concerned with what is happening “now”, EAM is concerned with ensuring assets continue to perform effectively “over time”.

From an organisational change management perspective, implementing or upgrading a SCADA system often affects control room operators, automation engineers and operational technology specialists by changing how they monitor and respond to live operational conditions. Implementing an EAM system has a much broader organisational impact, requiring maintenance, engineering, operations, procurement and management teams to adopt consistent asset management practices, improve data quality and strengthen governance across the asset lifecycle. The greatest opportunity for change arises when organisations integrate the two systems, allowing operational events detected by SCADA to trigger maintenance activities within the EAM system. Achieving this requires not only technical integration but also agreement on business processes, data ownership, response protocols and decision-making responsibilities.

Ultimately, SCADA and EAM are complementary technologies. SCADA provides real-time operational awareness, while EAM provides the structured processes needed to maintain the assets that keep operations running. From an organisational change perspective, the goal is not simply to connect the systems, but to connect the people, processes and decisions that allow operational intelligence to be translated into effective maintenance and long-term asset management outcomes.

PLM

Product Lifecycle Management (PLM) and Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) systems both manage information across a lifecycle, but they do so from fundamentally different perspectives. While a PLM system focuses on designing and engineering products or assets before they are built, an EAM system focuses on managing those assets once they are commissioned and operating. Appreciating this distinction is essential when planning organisational change, particularly in industries where engineering, projects and operations must work seamlessly together.

A PLM system manages engineering knowledge throughout the design and development lifecycle. It controls product structures, engineering drawings, technical specifications, bills of materials, design revisions and configuration changes. Its users are typically engineers, designers, and project teams responsible for creating, modifying, and approving technical designs before physical assets enter service.

An EAM system assumes responsibility once an asset becomes operational. It manages maintenance strategies, inspections, work orders, operational history, asset performance, lifecycle costs and eventual renewal or disposal. Rather than asking "how should this asset be designed?", an EAM system asks "how should this asset be operated, maintained and optimised throughout its useful life?"

From an organisational change management perspective, PLM implementations primarily transform engineering processes, improving collaboration, configuration control and design governance. EAM implementations have a broader operational impact, requiring maintenance, operations, engineering, procurement and leadership teams to work from a common understanding of asset information and lifecycle management. The greatest organisational challenge often occurs during the transition from project delivery to operations, when responsibility for the asset passes from engineering teams to those responsible for its operation and maintenance. Successfully managing this handover requires not only the transfer of technical data but also clear governance, agreed business processes and confidence that the information required to support ongoing operations is complete, accurate and trusted.

PLM and EAM should therefore be viewed as complementary systems supporting different stages of the asset lifecycle. PLM ensures that assets are designed, engineered and documented effectively, while EAM ensures those assets continue to deliver value throughout their operational life. From an organisational change perspective, success depends on creating continuity between engineering and operations so that the knowledge developed during design becomes the foundation for safe, reliable, and efficient asset management long after the project is completed.

When I was an Advanced Design Manager (sitting in between sales and core engineering), the most effective way I could link PLM and EAM was the consideration of the "whole of life" PLM is often guilty of designing for fit, form and function, but the downstream impacts are assumed to be picked up by O&M. (Martin)

Asset Information Management

An Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) system is only as effective as the quality of the asset information it contains. Organisations often invest significant time and resources in selecting and implementing an EAM platform, yet pay far less attention to the governance, ownership, and quality of the information that enables the system to deliver value. From an organisational change perspective, this is one of the most common reasons EAM implementations fail to achieve their intended outcomes.

Asset Information Management (AIM) is the discipline of ensuring that asset information is created, maintained, governed and used effectively throughout the entire asset lifecycle. It establishes the standards, processes, and responsibilities that ensure information remains accurate, complete, consistent, and trusted from initial design through commissioning, operation, maintenance, modification, and eventual decommissioning. An EAM system relies upon this information to support planning, decision-making, maintenance execution, regulatory compliance and lifecycle optimisation.

The organisational change challenge is not simply about improving data quality; it is about changing behaviours surrounding information ownership and accountability. Every function that creates or uses asset information, including engineering, projects, operations, maintenance, procurement, and contractors, must recognise that the information it produces is an organisational asset in its own right. This requires clear governance, agreed data standards, defined ownership, disciplined business processes and a culture that values information as highly as the physical assets it represents.

Too often, organisations view data migration as a one-off project activity completed before go-live. In reality, Asset Information Management is an ongoing organisational capability that continues long after implementation. As assets are modified, replaced or retired, the associated information must evolve with them. From an organisational change management perspective, success is achieved when maintaining high-quality asset information becomes part of everyday work rather than an administrative task performed only when problems arise. When people understand that reliable asset information enables better decisions, safer operations and improved asset performance, the EAM system becomes more than a repository of records; it becomes a trusted source of organisational knowledge that supports the entire asset lifecycle.

An organisation that treats asset information as an asset in its own right will ultimately embed a culture of trusted, informed decision-making. An organisation that treats it as compliant admin will end up with a liability. (Martin)

Digital Engineering

As organisations accelerate their digital transformation initiatives, Digital Engineering and Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) are increasingly discussed together. While both rely on high-quality asset information and digital technologies, they serve different purposes across the asset lifecycle. Recognising these differences is essential to delivering meaningful organisational change rather than simply introducing new digital tools.

Digital Engineering is concerned with creating, managing and integrating digital representations of assets throughout their design, construction and commissioning phases. It brings together engineering data, three-dimensional models, digital twins, simulation, configuration management and information standards to improve collaboration and decision-making before assets become operational. The focus is on designing assets correctly, validating engineering decisions and ensuring that accurate information is available as projects progress.

An EAM system takes over once those assets enter service. Its purpose is to manage the operational lifecycle of physical assets by supporting maintenance planning, inspections, work execution, reliability improvement, asset performance monitoring and lifecycle decision-making. While Digital Engineering establishes the digital foundation for an asset, EAM ensures that the asset continues to deliver value throughout its operational life.

From an organisational change management perspective, Digital Engineering primarily transforms how project teams, designers, engineers, and contractors collaborate to create and hand over assets and information. An EAM implementation has a broader operational impact, changing how maintenance, operations, engineering, supply chain and management teams use that information to make informed decisions every day. The greatest organisational challenge lies at the interface between these disciplines. Too often, projects conclude with a technical handover of drawings, models and documentation, but without ensuring that operational teams receive the trusted, structured asset information required to effectively manage the asset within the EAM system. Closing this gap requires more than technology integration; it demands aligned governance, clear information ownership, standardised data requirements and a shared understanding of what constitutes operational readiness.

Digital Engineering and EAM should therefore be viewed as complementary capabilities rather than competing systems or disciplines. Digital Engineering creates the information that defines the asset, while EAM manages the information that sustains the asset throughout its operational life. From an organisational change perspective, the objective is to create a seamless flow of trusted information from project conception through to asset retirement, ensuring that each lifecycle stage builds on the knowledge from the previous stage. When organisations achieve this continuity, they not only improve the performance of their EAM system but also realise the full value of their digital engineering investment.

Digital Twins

Building Information Modelling (BIM), Digital Twins and Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) are frequently described as complementary components of a digital asset strategy. However, they are often misunderstood as competing technologies or viewed as different versions of the same capability. From an organisational change perspective, they serve distinct purposes, involve different stakeholders, and require different changes in how people work.

BIM is primarily concerned with the planning, design and construction of assets. It provides a rich digital representation of an asset's physical and functional characteristics, enabling architects, engineers, designers and construction teams to collaborate throughout the project lifecycle. BIM improves design coordination, reduces rework, and creates a valuable source of engineering information that can be handed over upon project completion.

A Digital Twin extends this concept by creating a living digital representation of an operational asset. It combines engineering information with real-time operational data, sensor inputs and analytical models to reflect the current condition and behaviour of the physical asset. Rather than being a static model, a Digital Twin supports simulation, predictive analytics, and scenario planning, enabling organisations to better understand asset performance, operational risk, and future outcomes.

An EAM system performs a different role. It is the operational system responsible for managing the asset throughout its lifecycle. It plans and records maintenance activities, manages inspections and work orders, controls asset history, supports reliability improvement and enables lifecycle decision-making. While BIM provides the design information and a Digital Twin provides operational insight, an EAM system provides the governance, processes and discipline needed to manage the work required to maintain and optimise the asset.

From an organisational change management perspective, BIM changes how projects are designed and delivered; Digital Twins change how organisations analyse and predict asset behaviour; and EAM changes how people execute, govern, and continuously improve asset management practices. The greatest organisational value is realised when these capabilities are connected rather than implemented in isolation. This requires project teams, engineering, operations, maintenance and information management functions to share ownership of asset information across the lifecycle. It also requires a shift in mindset from treating digital models as project deliverables to recognising them as strategic organisational assets that continue to evolve and support decision-making long after construction has finished. Successful organisations understand that BIM, Digital Twins and EAM are not separate initiatives but interconnected capabilities that collectively improve asset performance, organisational resilience and long-term value.

Business capability versus software capability

One of the most common mistakes in Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation is assuming that purchasing software automatically delivers organisational capability. In reality, software provides functionality, but business capability is created only when people, processes, information, governance and technology work together to achieve a desired outcome. Confusing these two concepts often leads organisations to overestimate what technology can deliver and underestimate the organisational change required to realise its value.

Software capability refers to what a system is technically capable of doing. An EAM platform may provide sophisticated functions for work management, asset hierarchies, reliability analysis, mobile inspections, inventory control and lifecycle reporting. These

capabilities are built into the application from the day it is installed. However, their presence does not mean the organisation is capable of using them effectively. A feature that is enabled but poorly adopted delivers little more than the illusion of progress.

Business capability, by contrast, is the organisation's demonstrated ability to consistently achieve a business outcome. For example, effective maintenance planning is not created simply because an EAM system includes a planning module. It depends on clearly defined roles, competent planners, standardised work management processes, accurate asset information, meaningful performance measures and leadership that reinforces disciplined planning practices. The software enables the capability, but the organisation creates it.

From an organisational change management perspective, the objective should never be to implement software; it should be to build sustainable business capability. This requires a deliberate focus on behaviour, decision-making, governance and continuous improvement. Leaders must shift the conversation from asking, "Does the system support this?" to asking, "Can our organisation consistently perform this activity to the required standard?" The answer is rarely determined solely by technology.

Successful EAM implementations recognise that software capability is only one component of organisational capability. The system may provide the tools, but it is the people who apply them, the processes that guide them, the information that informs them and the governance that sustains them. When organisations understand this distinction, they stop measuring success by the number of functions deployed and start measuring it by the business outcomes achieved. That is the point at which technology becomes an enabler of transformation rather than simply another enterprise application.

- PLM – Design and engineer the asset.
- ERP – Acquire and financially manage the asset.
- EAM – Operate and maintain the asset.
- APM – Optimise the asset's performance.
- GIS – Understand where the asset exists and how it connects.
- SCADA – Monitor and control the asset in real time.
- CMMS – Execute maintenance activities on the asset.

Software capability answers "What can the system consistently do?"

Business capability answers "What can the organisation consistently do?"

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations

Introducing an EAM fundamentally changes how people manage assets, not just replacing software.	Asset information must remain controlled throughout migration and implementation.
Business capability should always drive technology decisions.	Changes to asset structures and hierarchies require appropriate governance.
Every integrated system changes how people collaborate across departments.	Interfaces between operational systems should be validated before deployment.
Different stakeholder groups experience the same implementation differently.	Master data changes require approval to preserve operational integrity.
Training should explain why new practices improve asset performance, not simply how to use screens.	Configuration changes should always be traceable throughout the project lifecycle.
Successful EAM implementations improve organisational capability before technical capability.	Digital information should remain a trusted representation of physical assets.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Discover
Also Supports	Define
Why it matters	Establishing a common understanding of Enterprise Asset Management provides the foundation for every subsequent decision about change.

Technology manages assets. Organisations realise value. In my experience, organisations achieve the greatest value when they stop viewing EAM as a software project and begin treating it as an organisational capability. The technology enables better decisions; it is governance, ownership and operational discipline that determine whether those decisions produce better outcomes. (Peter)

Chapter 3 - The Difference Between OCM and MoC

In asset-intensive industries, most professionals understand that Asset Management and asset management are not the same thing. The management of assets is concerned with maintaining, operating and replacing individual assets safely and efficiently. Asset Management, by comparison, is the broader management system that aligns assets with organisational objectives, balancing cost, risk, performance and value across the entire asset lifecycle. One focuses on doing the work; the other focuses on ensuring the organisation consistently delivers the right outcomes through that work.

A similar distinction exists between Organisational Change Management (OCM) and the Management of Change (MoC). Unfortunately, because both disciplines include the word change, they are frequently treated as interchangeable. They are not. Asset

Management and asset management operate at different levels, have different objectives, and require different capabilities, yet they complement one another to achieve successful business outcomes.

Organisational Change Management is the strategic discipline of preparing the organisation for change. It is concerned with people, leadership, culture, capability, behaviours and the adoption of new ways of working. Its purpose is to ensure that change is understood, accepted and sustained so that the investment in technology, process or organisational redesign delivers lasting business value.

Management of Change, on the other hand, is the governance discipline that controls how individual changes are introduced. It ensures that changes are identified, assessed, approved, documented, communicated and implemented in a structured and controlled manner. While Organisational Change Management asks whether the organisation is ready to embrace change, Management of Change asks whether the specific change has been properly governed and whether its associated risks have been effectively managed.

Neither discipline is sufficient on its own. An organisation can have excellent Management of Change processes that safely introduce hundreds of controlled changes, yet still fail because its people never adopt the new ways of working. Equally, an organisation can invest heavily in communications, leadership, and capability development but introduce poorly governed operational changes that create risk, inconsistency, and confusion. Sustainable transformation requires both disciplines to work together.

Throughout this book, we intentionally distinguish between Organisational Change Management and Management of Change. Our experience has shown that some of the most successful Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementations recognise the strengths of both. They govern change with discipline while leading people with purpose. Understanding where one ends and the other begins is not simply a matter of terminology; it is a defining characteristic of successful organisational transformation.

What is Organisational Change Management (OCM)?

Organisational Change Management (OCM) is the structured discipline of preparing, equipping and supporting people to successfully adopt new ways of working enabled by an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) system. While the EAM platform provides the technology, OCM ensures that the organisation is ready, willing and capable of using it to achieve the intended business outcomes.

In an EAM implementation, OCM extends beyond training users to navigate screens or complete transactions. It begins with understanding why the organisation is investing in EAM, how roles and responsibilities will change, what capabilities need to be developed, and how leaders will support the transition. It considers organisational readiness, stakeholder engagement, communications, leadership alignment, culture, business processes, governance, competencies and performance measures.

The objective of OCM is not simply to deliver a system that works, but to enable an organisation that works differently.

Success is measured by sustained adoption, improved decision-making, consistent asset management practices and the realisation of the benefits outlined in the business case. In essence, OCM is about changing organisational behaviour so that the EAM system becomes an embedded part of how the business operates rather than another piece of software that employees are expected to use.

From this perspective, OCM is a strategic, business-focused discipline concerned with people, capability and organisational effectiveness.

What is Management of Change (MoC)?

The Management of Change (MoC) is the governance and control process used to manage individual changes in a structured, documented and risk-managed manner. It focuses on ensuring that proposed changes are identified, assessed, approved, implemented and reviewed without introducing unacceptable risk to the organisation, its assets, its people or its operations.

Within an EAM implementation, MoC applies to the management of specific changes such as modifications to maintenance strategies, asset hierarchies, work management processes, organisational structures, system configurations, master data, integrations or operational procedures. Each change is evaluated for its technical, operational, safety, regulatory and business impacts before implementation.

It is also the change behind the change: the temporary organisation that will send members of the organisation back out into the organisation with new capabilities and, if done right, champions of the change and asset management as a whole. (Peter)

Unlike Organisational Change Management, which focuses on enabling people to adopt a new operating model, Management of Change focuses on controlling the change itself. It establishes governance mechanisms, including impact assessments, approvals, testing, documentation, version control, and post-implementation review, to ensure that changes are implemented safely and consistently.

Management of Change is therefore an operational governance discipline.

It provides assurance that individual changes are introduced in a controlled manner, while Organisational Change Management ensures the organisation can embrace and sustain those changes.

Delivery teams often say, “Trust us, we have done this before.” The business response is equally valid: “Trust us, we understand how this organisation actually works.”

Management of Change must reconcile both perspectives. A credible change plan should explain what is changing, why it is necessary, how decisions will be made, what risks must be controlled and how the business will be supported.

Delivery dates and success measures should only be confirmed once the organisation understands the change and has had the opportunity to test its operational practicality.

Trust should not be requested. It should be earned through transparency, evidence and responsible business involvement. (Peter)

Where each applies

Organisational Change Management applies throughout the entire lifecycle of an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) initiative, beginning long before software is selected and continuing well after the system goes live. It is concerned with preparing the organisation to successfully transition from its current state ("as is") to its future operating model ("to be"). This includes establishing the vision for change, building the business case, assessing organisational readiness, engaging stakeholders, designing future ways of working, developing leadership capability, managing communications, delivering learning programs, supporting adoption, measuring behavioural change and embedding new practices into business-as-usual operations.

In practical terms, OCM touches every part of the organisation affected by the EAM implementation. It works with executives to create sponsorship, with managers to lead their teams through change, with operational personnel to understand how their work will evolve, and with project teams to ensure that business decisions consider people as much as technology. Rather than being a workstream that exists alongside the project, Organisational Change Management provides the connective tissue between strategy, technology and operations, ensuring that the investment delivers sustainable business value rather than simply deploying new software.

Organisational Change Management asks:

- Why are we changing?
- Who will be affected?
- How do we prepare people?
- How do we build capability and adoption?
- How do we sustain new ways of working?

The Management of Change applies wherever a specific change to the business, its assets or its operating environment needs to be introduced in a controlled and governed manner. During an EAM implementation, this includes changes to maintenance strategies, asset criticality models, work management processes, approval workflows, organisational structures, equipment master data, system configurations, integration interfaces, reporting, governance frameworks and standard operating procedures. Each change is assessed for risk, reviewed by appropriate stakeholders, approved through defined governance processes and verified before becoming operational.

Importantly, Management of Change does not end when the EAM project is completed. It becomes an ongoing operational capability that ensures future modifications to the EAM platform and its associated business processes remain controlled, traceable and compliant. Whether introducing a new maintenance methodology, changing asset classifications, modifying workflows or deploying a software enhancement, Management of Change ensures that every change is evaluated, documented, communicated and implemented safely. It protects the integrity of the operating environment, while Organisational Change Management protects the organisation's ability to successfully adopt and sustain those changes.

Management of Change asks:

- What exactly is changing?
- What are the risks?
- Who must approve the change?
- How will it be controlled and documented?
- How do we ensure the change is implemented safely and correctly?

A useful way to distinguish the two is this:

Organisational Change Management is about changing people and organisations so they can successfully adopt new ways of working. Management of Change is about governing and controlling the individual changes that enable those new ways of working.

For a successful Enterprise Asset Management implementation, both disciplines are essential. An organisation with excellent OCM but weak MoC may achieve high enthusiasm but introduce poorly governed changes that create operational risk. Conversely, an organisation with rigorous MoC but poor OCM may implement technically sound changes that employees neither understand nor adopt. Sustainable EAM success is achieved only when governance of change and adoption of change are treated as complementary disciplines rather than interchangeable concepts.

Why confusing them creates implementation failure

One of the most common and costly mistakes in Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementations is treating Organisational Change Management (OCM) and Management of Change (MoC) as one and the same. Although they share the word "change," they address fundamentally different problems. Organisational Change Management prepares people and the organisation to adopt new ways of working, while Management of Change governs and controls individual changes to ensure they are implemented safely, consistently, and with appropriate oversight. When organisations fail to recognise this distinction, gaps emerge that no amount of software functionality can overcome.

Many projects assume that because a formal Management of Change process exists, organisational change has been addressed. Project teams produce impact assessments, complete approval workflows, update documentation and obtain governance sign-off, believing the organisation is ready for go-live. In reality, these activities demonstrate that the change has been authorised, not that it has been

accepted. Employees may still lack understanding of why the change is occurring, managers may be unprepared to lead their teams, and established workplace behaviours may remain unchanged. Governance may have been successful, but adoption has not.

The opposite mistake is equally damaging. Some organisations invest heavily in communications, training and stakeholder engagement but neglect the discipline of Management of Change. Staff may be enthusiastic about the future, but poorly governed changes to maintenance strategies, asset hierarchies, workflows or system configuration can introduce operational risk, inconsistent practices and regulatory or safety issues. Without robust change governance, the organisation may successfully adopt processes that were never adequately assessed or controlled.

Confusing these two disciplines also leads to misplaced accountability. Technology teams often believe that user training is sufficient to satisfy organisational change requirements, while business leaders assume that project governance covers all aspects of change. As a result, no one takes ownership of developing organisational capability, embedding new behaviours or ensuring that individual changes are introduced through an appropriate governance framework.

The project becomes technically successful but operationally disappointing, with low adoption, inconsistent data quality, workarounds and limited realisation of business benefits.

The most successful EAM implementations recognise that both disciplines are essential and mutually reinforcing. Management of Change ensures that every change introduced into the organisation is properly assessed, approved and controlled. Organisational Change Management ensures that the people affected by those changes understand them, embrace them and sustain them long after the project has closed. One governs the change itself; the other enables the organisation to live with that change. Sustainable transformation occurs only when both disciplines work together as complementary components of the same implementation strategy.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
OCM focuses on people successfully adopting new ways of working.	MoC focuses on safely controlling changes to operational environments.
Communication without behavioural change is not effective OCM.	Every operational change should be risk assessed before implementation.
Readiness is measured by confidence, capability and commitment.	Approval processes exist to protect people, assets and operations.
Leaders influence adoption through visible behaviours rather than announcements.	Technical modifications should never be made to bypass governance because of project deadlines.
OCM continues well beyond go-live as habits become embedded.	Temporary project decisions frequently become permanent operational practices if left uncontrolled.

Sustainable change requires culture, leadership and governance to work together.	MoC ensures organisational improvements never compromise operational safety or compliance.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Discover
Also Supports	Define
Why it matters	Clarifying the distinction between OCM and MoC establishes governance, responsibilities and expectations before delivery begins.

When I look back over my career, one lesson stands out above almost every other. Organisations rarely fail because they selected the wrong software. They fail because they underestimate what it takes for people to genuinely change the way they think, make decisions and perform their work. I've seen organisations spend months selecting technology and only days preparing the people expected to use it. It has reinforced my belief that technology is rarely the hardest part of transformation. Helping people let go of familiar habits, build confidence and embrace new ways of working is where the real challenge lies.

For me, Enterprise Asset Management has never been about implementing software. It has always been about building organisational capability. Every project reminds me that success depends less on the system itself and more on leadership, trust, communication, and the creation of an environment where people understand not only what is changing but also why it matters. (Martin)

My experience has led me to a different, but complementary, conclusion. Every change introduces risk, whether it affects technology, business processes or the operation of critical assets. Throughout my career I have seen organisations become so focused on delivering projects that they unintentionally weaken the operational controls that protect their people, assets and services.

I've learnt that governance should never be viewed as bureaucracy. Good governance creates confidence because everyone understands who makes decisions, how risks are managed and how changes are introduced safely. In my experience, organisations that consistently perform well are those that improve continuously without ever compromising operational discipline. (Peter)

Part Two - Building the Case for Change

Chapter 4 - Developing the Business Case

One of the first questions any organisation must answer before embarking on an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) programme is a simple one: Why are we doing this? Surprisingly, many organisations struggle to provide a clear answer beyond replacing an ageing system, consolidating multiple applications or responding to the

end of vendor support. While these may create urgency, they rarely provide sufficient justification for the level of investment, organisational disruption and long-term commitment required to successfully implement an EAM platform.

Over the years, we have reviewed countless business cases for EAM and related transformation programmes. A common pattern quickly emerges. The financial investment is usually well documented, the implementation timeline is carefully planned, and the technology solution is clearly described. However, the expected benefits are often expressed as intangible aspirations, such as better visibility, improved decision-making, increased efficiency, enhanced collaboration, or becoming "data-driven". While all of these are worthwhile objectives, they are difficult to measure and even harder to hold an organisation accountable for delivering.

Another common justification is simply that the existing system is no longer fit for purpose. Legacy technology eventually becomes expensive to support, difficult to integrate, vulnerable from a cybersecurity perspective or reaches end-of-life. Replacing obsolete technology is often necessary, but it is not, by itself, a compelling business case. Organisations can spend millions replacing one legacy system with another modern platform, yet continue to experience the same operational frustrations if the underlying processes, governance, data quality, and organisational behaviours remain unchanged. A new system may remove technical constraints, but it cannot automatically remove organisational ones.

The strongest business cases recognise that technology is only one component of enterprise capability. They connect strategic objectives with operational improvements, quantify financial and risk outcomes wherever possible, and acknowledge that lasting value depends upon changes in people, processes, governance and culture. Rather than presenting software as the solution, they position the EAM programme as an investment in improving the organisation's ability to manage its assets more effectively throughout their entire lifecycle.

This distinction is particularly important from an Organisational Change Management perspective. People are rarely motivated by the retirement of a legacy application. They become motivated when they understand how the change will make their work safer, easier, more productive or more meaningful, while helping the organisation achieve its broader strategic objectives. A business case that focuses solely on technology rarely generates sustained commitment. A business case built around organisational capability, operational performance and measurable business value provides the foundation for genuine transformation.

The following sections explore the major elements that contribute to a robust business case. Together they demonstrate that a successful EAM programme is not justified by the software it replaces, but by the organisational capability it creates, the risks it reduces and the value it delivers long after the project team has left.

Building the Case for Change

Every successful Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation begins long before software is selected. It starts with building a compelling case for change that explains why the organisation must operate differently in the future. Too often,

organisations begin projects because existing technology is outdated or because a vendor has demonstrated impressive functionality. While these may be contributing factors, they rarely justify the significant investment, disruption and organisational effort required to transform asset management practices.

Building the case for change requires an honest assessment of the current state. Organisations need to understand where operational inefficiencies exist, where asset information cannot be trusted, where maintenance practices are inconsistent, and where business objectives are being compromised. The conversation should focus on business capability rather than software capability.

Technology is simply an enabler; the real objective is to improve how the organisation manages its assets throughout their lifecycle.

From an Organisational Change Management (OCM) perspective, the case for change provides the foundation for every communication, decision and engagement activity that follows. People are far more willing to embrace change when they understand why it is necessary, what problems it will solve, and how it will improve their ability to perform their roles. Without a clear case for change, resistance often grows because employees perceive the initiative as another technology project rather than an operational improvement programme.

The strongest cases for change combine strategic ambition with practical operational realities. They recognise that better information, better processes and better decisions ultimately lead to safer operations, lower costs, improved reliability and greater organisational resilience. When the business case is built around these outcomes, the EAM programme becomes an investment in organisational capability rather than simply another software implementation.

I have worked with many organisations at the front end of the process. Coming up with (sometimes creating) benefits, quantifying them, selling them and documenting them. Then finance builds in their cost-benefit analysis and so on. In most instances (especially in government and public sectors), there isn't an appetite to explore intangible benefits. This is a shame, as the intangible benefits are the easiest to align your OCM roadmap with. (Martin)

Developing the Business Case

Once the need for change has been established, the next step is to develop a robust business case that demonstrates the value of investing in an EAM programme. A business case is not merely a financial document submitted for executive approval; it is the strategic blueprint that aligns organisational priorities, investment decisions and expected benefits.

An effective business case considers far more than software licensing and implementation costs. It evaluates current operational performance, identifies measurable opportunities for improvement, estimates implementation effort, quantifies

benefits where possible, and acknowledges risks and dependencies. Importantly, it also recognises the investment required in people, data, governance, training and organisational change activities, not just technology.

Many organisations underestimate the importance of non-technical investment. Experience consistently shows that projects that allocate sufficient funding to change management, business readiness, and data improvement achieve significantly higher adoption and longer-term value than those focused primarily on software deployment.

The business case should become a living document rather than a once-off approval paper. Throughout the programme it should be revisited, refined and used to measure whether anticipated benefits are being realised. This creates accountability and ensures the programme remains focused on delivering business outcomes rather than simply completing project milestones.

Strategic drivers

Strategic drivers explain why an EAM programme is important to the organisation's long-term direction. These drivers typically originate from executive leadership and reflect broader business objectives such as growth, sustainability, operational excellence, digital transformation or improved customer outcomes.

An organisation may require greater visibility into asset performance to support expansion into new markets, improve service delivery, meet environmental commitments, or modernise ageing infrastructure. In each case, the EAM platform becomes one component of a much larger strategic agenda rather than an isolated IT initiative.

Organisational Change Management ensures employees understand this broader context. When people recognise that the programme supports organisational strategy rather than simply introducing new software, they are more likely to appreciate its importance and engage positively with the changes required.

Strong strategic drivers also assist with decision-making throughout the programme. They provide a consistent reference point whenever priorities compete, ensuring that implementation decisions continue to support the organisation's long-term objectives rather than short-term convenience.

Operational drivers

Operational drivers are often the most visible reasons organisations pursue an EAM implementation because they directly affect day-to-day performance. Maintenance teams may struggle with inconsistent work management; planners may lack reliable asset information; field crews may rely on paper processes; and managers may have limited visibility into operational performance.

These operational inefficiencies lead to wasted effort, reactive maintenance, duplicated work, poor scheduling, and inconsistent decision-making. Often, different sites develop their own practices over many years, making standardisation difficult and limiting enterprise-wide reporting.

While technology can enable more efficient workflows, sustainable operational improvements require changes in behaviours, responsibilities, and ways of working. Organisational Change Management focuses on helping employees adopt these new practices so that improved processes become part of normal operations rather than temporary project activities.

The operational drivers should therefore be expressed in business language: improving planning effectiveness, increasing schedule compliance, reducing equipment downtime, improving information quality and enabling consistent maintenance practices across the enterprise. These outcomes resonate far more strongly than lists of software features.

Financial drivers

Financial drivers provide the economic rationale for investment in an EAM programme. Organisations expect improved asset management to reduce unnecessary expenditure while increasing the value obtained from existing infrastructure and equipment.

Financial benefits commonly include reduced maintenance costs, lower inventory holdings, extended asset life, improved workforce productivity, reduced contractor expenditure and fewer unexpected equipment failures. Better planning and scheduling also reduce overtime and emergency work, creating additional operational savings.

However, organisations should avoid overstating financial returns. Many benefits emerge gradually as new processes mature and staff develop confidence using the new system. Unrealistic savings assumptions frequently undermine executive confidence when early expectations are not immediately achieved.

Organisational Change Management contributes directly to financial outcomes because user adoption determines whether expected efficiencies are realised. Even the most capable EAM platform cannot generate financial benefits if people continue working around the system or maintain existing manual practices. Sustainable financial improvement depends on sustained behavioural change.

A key perspective in any business is that finance seeks to understand the value of an asset, whereas asset managers seek to understand the value from an asset. This has always allowed me to position discussions done through the organisation and across the lifecycle. (Martin)

Regulatory drivers

Many industries operate within increasingly complex regulatory environments where accurate asset information, maintenance records and documented decision-making are essential. Utilities, mining, transport, defence, healthcare, manufacturing and government agencies all face significant obligations relating to safety, environmental management, reliability and compliance.

An effective EAM platform supports regulatory compliance by providing traceability, standardised processes, audit history, and consistent record-keeping. However, compliance should never be viewed as simply capturing more data. The information

recorded must be accurate, complete and consistently maintained throughout the asset lifecycle.

Organisational Change Management plays an important role by ensuring employees understand not only what information must be captured, but why it matters. When staff appreciate the regulatory and operational consequences of incomplete or inaccurate information, data quality becomes part of everyday practice rather than an administrative burden.

Ultimately, regulatory compliance is achieved through disciplined organisational behaviour supported by technology, not through technology alone.

Risk drivers

Every organisation manages risk, whether operational, financial, safety, environmental or reputational. Poor asset information, inconsistent maintenance practices and fragmented business processes significantly increase these risks by reducing confidence in operational decision-making.

An EAM programme helps organisations better understand asset condition, maintenance history, work execution and operational performance. This enables more informed, risk-based decision-making, improved maintenance prioritisation, and greater visibility into emerging issues before they become significant failures.

From an OCM perspective, risk management extends beyond physical assets. The implementation itself introduces organisational risk if employees are unprepared, governance is weak, or adoption is inconsistent. Managing stakeholder engagement, leadership alignment and organisational readiness therefore becomes a critical component of programme risk management.

The strongest business cases demonstrate that investment in organisational capability simultaneously reduces operational and implementation risk, providing value well beyond technology deployment.

Benefits Realisation

Benefits realisation is the discipline of ensuring that expected business improvements are actually achieved after implementation. Many organisations set ambitious benefit targets during project approval but fail to actively monitor whether those benefits materialise.

Benefits should be linked directly to measurable business outcomes rather than project activities. Completing training, migrating data or deploying software are project outputs, not business benefits. Benefits include improved reliability, reduced downtime, increased productivity, improved decision-making, and higher-quality asset information.

Organisational Change Management is fundamental to benefits realisation because benefits only occur when people consistently adopt new behaviours and processes. Measuring system usage alone is insufficient; organisations must assess whether new ways of working are producing the intended operational improvements.

Benefits realisation should continue well beyond go-live. As organisational maturity increases, additional opportunities often emerge to optimise processes, improve reporting and expand the value delivered by the EAM platform.

Investment justification

Investment justification answers a fundamental executive question: why should the organisation commit significant resources to this initiative rather than to competing priorities? The answer must extend beyond replacing ageing software or modernising technology.

Effective investment justification combines quantitative evidence with qualitative business value. Financial modelling, operational metrics, risk reduction, compliance improvements and strategic alignment collectively demonstrate why investment is warranted. Equally important is acknowledging the investment required in people, governance, process improvement and organisational readiness.

One of the most common mistakes is presenting EAM as an IT expenditure. In reality, it represents an investment in improving the organisation's management of one of its largest sources of enterprise value: its physical assets. The software enables this capability but does not create it on its own.

Executives are more likely to support investment when the proposal clearly demonstrates how organisational capability, operational performance and business outcomes will improve over many years rather than simply describing technical implementation activities.

Executive sponsorship

Executive sponsorship is one of the strongest predictors of success in any major EAM implementation. Effective sponsors do far more than approve funding or attend project steering committee meetings. They actively champion the change, communicate its importance and demonstrate visible commitment throughout the programme.

Employees closely observe executive behaviour. When leaders consistently reinforce the programme's purpose, make timely decisions, and hold managers accountable for adoption, the organisation recognises that the initiative is a genuine business priority. Conversely, when executive sponsorship becomes passive, enthusiasm quickly diminishes and competing priorities take precedence.

Organisational Change Management works closely with executive sponsors to ensure leadership messages remain consistent, credible and aligned with organisational objectives. Sponsors should continually reinforce the business reasons for change, celebrate progress and help remove organisational barriers that impede adoption.

Ultimately, successful EAM implementations are led by the business, supported by technology and enabled by strong executive sponsorship. When leaders visibly own the transformation, the organisation is far more likely to embrace the new ways of working required to realise lasting business value.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
People support change when they understand why it matters to the organisation and to them personally.	Every business case should consider operational risk alongside financial return.
A compelling vision inspires commitment more effectively than a list of software features.	Major operational changes require formal governance from the earliest planning stages.
Executive sponsorship should be visible throughout the business case, not simply provide funding approval.	Regulatory and compliance obligations should influence investment decisions from the outset.
Benefits should be described in terms meaningful to each stakeholder group.	Proposed operational changes should be assessed for their impact on safety, reliability and service delivery.
The strongest business cases balance financial, operational and people outcomes.	Risk mitigation strategies should be embedded within the implementation approach, not added later.
The business case begins the organisational change journey, not the technology project.	Early governance decisions determine the level of control that will govern the program throughout.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Define
Also Supports	Discover
Why it matters	A compelling business case converts organisational insight into strategic intent, investment and sponsorship.

The strongest business cases I have worked with rarely started with technology. They started with frustration: information could not be trusted, decisions took too long, maintenance was disconnected from business priorities, and risk lacked visibility.

The technology became part of the solution, not the justification for investment. When the business case is built around organisational capability, the purpose of the transformation remains clearer throughout delivery.

This also requires accepting that modern COTS EAM platforms are designed around scalable, integrated practices. For multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional or multinational organisations, the transition to true EAM should begin with enterprise capability, not by recreating siloed systems and historical gaps in a new platform. (Peter)

Chapter 5 - Organisational Readiness

One of the most significant mistakes organisations make during an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation is assuming that readiness can be measured a few weeks before go-live. A checklist is completed, training is scheduled, data migration is nearly finished, and the system has passed testing, so the organisation is

declared "ready". In reality, organisational readiness begins long before software is configured and continues well after the system has been deployed. It is the cumulative result of leadership, capability, culture, governance and the organisation's capacity to embrace new ways of working.

Readiness is not simply about whether the project is prepared to deploy; it is about whether the organisation is prepared to change. An organisation may be technically ready while lacking the leadership commitment, business capability, asset management discipline, digital confidence or cultural alignment required to realise the benefits of its investment. Equally, an organisation with mature business practices and engaged leadership can often overcome technical challenges because its people understand the purpose of the transformation and are committed to its success.

For this reason, organisational readiness should be assessed across multiple dimensions rather than through a single go/no-go decision. The following sections explore the key factors that determine readiness, including organisational capability, asset management maturity, leadership and change maturity, digital literacy, data and business process readiness, organisational culture, political dynamics, competing initiatives and change saturation. Together, these dimensions provide a holistic view of an organisation's ability not only to implement an EAM system, but to successfully embed new ways of working that deliver lasting business value.

Throughout our careers, we have found that organisations rarely fail because they lack technology. They struggle because they overestimate their readiness to change. By taking a structured and honest view of organisational readiness, leaders can identify risks early, invest where it matters most and significantly improve the likelihood that an EAM implementation will deliver sustainable operational and strategic outcomes rather than becoming another software deployment that never fully achieves its promise.

Change readiness is often understood as a broad assessment of the delta, appetite, and ability to move from point A (as is) to point B (to be). In my experience, understanding how mature and stable "point A" is to begin with is more crucial than the journey itself. I see readiness as the difference between a foundation built on a "house of cards" and one built on "bricks and mortar". (Martin)

Readiness assessments

Readiness assessments are among the most valuable yet frequently overlooked activities in an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation. Too often organisations assume that because the project team is ready to deploy the solution, the business is equally prepared to adopt it. These are two very different measures. A project can be technically ready while the organisation remains operationally, culturally and strategically unprepared.

A readiness assessment provides an objective view of an organisation's ability to successfully transition from its current operating model to the future state. Rather than acting as a simple checklist before go-live, it should become an ongoing management tool that measures progress throughout the implementation lifecycle. It allows leaders

to understand where risks exist, where additional support is required and whether the organisation has the capacity to absorb the change.

An effective readiness assessment considers multiple dimensions including leadership commitment, governance, business capability, process maturity, workforce engagement, communication effectiveness, training preparedness, data quality, organisational capacity and cultural alignment. Importantly, it measures people readiness just as rigorously as technical readiness.

Readiness assessments also create an evidence-based approach to decision-making. Instead of relying on assumptions or optimism, executives can make informed decisions about deployment timing, additional investment and risk mitigation. In many cases, delaying a deployment by several weeks to improve organisational readiness delivers far greater long-term value than achieving an arbitrary project milestone.

Ultimately, readiness assessments answer a simple but critical question: Is the organisation genuinely prepared to work differently? If the answer is no, technology alone will not deliver the expected business outcomes.

Readiness assessments should be informed directly by the outputs of impact assessments.

This creates a clear line between what is changing, who is affected, what must be communicated or controlled, and what evidence is required before the organisation can be considered ready.

When impact and readiness activities are treated as connected, they provide a practical path toward operational readiness rather than becoming separate artefacts completed only to satisfy project governance. (Peter)

Asset Management Understanding

Asset Management understanding measures how effectively an organisation understands and to what extent it applies asset management principles to achieve its business objectives. It extends well beyond the maintenance function and considers whether decisions about assets are aligned with organisational strategy, risk appetite, service delivery requirements and whole-of-life value. An Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) system should enable mature asset management practices, but it cannot create them on its own.

Many organisations begin an EAM implementation believing they have mature asset management because they maintain assets effectively or have invested in modern maintenance systems. However, true maturity encompasses much more. It includes strategic asset planning, lifecycle management, risk-based decision-making, asset information governance, investment planning, performance measurement, and continuous improvement. These capabilities are described in frameworks such as ISO 55000, which emphasise that asset management is an organisational discipline rather than simply a maintenance activity.

Assessing asset management maturity provides a realistic understanding of where the organisation currently operates and identifies the gaps that an EAM implementation

must address. An organisation with low maturity may have inconsistent maintenance strategies, fragmented asset information, unclear ownership, reactive decision-making and limited performance measures. Conversely, mature organisations make evidence-based decisions using reliable information, clearly defined governance and integrated planning across engineering, operations, finance and maintenance.

Asset management maturity also influences implementation design. Organisations with emerging maturity often benefit from establishing foundational disciplines before introducing advanced EAM functionality. Attempting to implement sophisticated capabilities such as predictive maintenance, risk-based work management or lifecycle optimisation without mature governance and business practices frequently results in complexity without corresponding business value.

For this reason, asset management maturity should be assessed early and revisited throughout the implementation. It provides an objective baseline against which organisational improvement can be measured and helps ensure that the implementation delivers more than a new technology platform. The ultimate goal is to improve the organisation's ability to manage its assets effectively, efficiently, and sustainably throughout their lifecycle. Technology is an enabler of that outcome, not the outcome itself.

Simplifying what asset management maturity actually is can be reduced to one of the definitions… "The coordinated activity of an organisation to realise value from assets". It is the coordination (or lack of it) that defines an organisation's maturity. (Martin)

Digital Literacy

Digital literacy is often underestimated when assessing organisational readiness for an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation. Many organisations assume that because employees use computers, smartphones or existing business systems, they possess the digital skills necessary to successfully adopt a modern EAM platform. In reality, digital literacy encompasses far more than technical competence; it reflects an individual's confidence, capability and willingness to work effectively in an increasingly digital environment.

A modern EAM solution changes the way work is planned, executed, recorded and analysed. Technicians may transition from paper-based work orders to mobile devices; supervisors may rely on dashboards instead of spreadsheets; planners may use advanced scheduling tools; and managers may make decisions using real-time performance data. These changes require users to understand not only how to operate the software but also why digital information is critical to effective asset management.

Assessing digital literacy provides valuable insight into where additional support may be required. Factors such as familiarity with mobile technology, confidence using enterprise applications, understanding of data quality, ability to interpret digital reports and willingness to adopt new technologies all influence implementation success. It is also important to recognise that digital literacy varies significantly across roles, locations, age groups and levels of operational experience. Assuming that all users have the same capabilities often leads to ineffective training and poor adoption.

Improving digital literacy should not be viewed as a training exercise delivered immediately before go-live. It is an organisational capability that can be developed progressively throughout the implementation. Practical coaching, hands-on learning, peer support, digital champions and ongoing reinforcement often produce better outcomes than classroom-based system training alone. Equally important is helping employees understand how digital ways of working improve safety, productivity, decision-making and service delivery, rather than simply teaching them which buttons to press.

As organisations continue their digital transformation, digital literacy becomes a strategic capability rather than a project requirement. An EAM implementation provides an opportunity to strengthen this capability across the workforce, creating benefits that extend well beyond the technology itself. Organisations that invest in digital literacy are better positioned to realise the full value of their EAM investment because they prepare people to embrace digital ways of working, not merely to use a new system.

Do not assume that a workforce has a consistent level of digital literacy. This needs to be approached with finesse and care because alienating people who aren't savvy is the faster way to erode organisational knowledge, because they are likely to clam up rather than admit it. (Martin)

Data Readiness

Data is the lifeblood of an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) system. Every maintenance decision, work order, asset history, lifecycle analysis, and performance report depends on the availability of accurate, complete, and trusted information. Yet one of the most common misconceptions in EAM implementations is that data readiness is simply about migrating information from one system to another. In reality, data readiness is about ensuring that the organisation can create, govern, maintain, and use high-quality asset information long after implementation is complete.

Poor data quality rarely originates from technology. It is usually the result of inconsistent business processes, unclear ownership, differing standards and years of accumulated workarounds. Duplicate assets, incomplete equipment hierarchies, missing maintenance histories, inconsistent naming conventions and inaccurate bills of materials are symptoms of broader organisational issues rather than isolated technical problems.

Assessing data readiness involves far more than measuring data completeness. Organisations should evaluate the quality, consistency and integrity of asset information, while also considering governance arrangements, ownership, stewardship and the processes used to create and maintain data throughout the asset lifecycle. Questions such as Who owns the data?, Who is responsible for maintaining it?, How are standards enforced? and whether the business can trust the information it uses to make decisions are just as important as the data itself.

Data readiness also extends beyond master data. Maintenance history, condition information, inspection records, inventory data, engineering documentation and operational information all contribute to informed asset management decisions. An

EAM system only delivers value when these information sources are accurate, connected and maintained over time.

Organisations that invest in data readiness before implementation significantly reduce implementation risk and accelerate business adoption. More importantly, they establish the governance and accountability required to ensure that data remains a strategic organisational asset rather than becoming another technical problem to be solved later.

Business process Readiness

Business process readiness measures whether an organisation has defined, agreed and prepared its future ways of working before introducing an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) system. It recognises that software should support well-designed business processes rather than become the mechanism for inventing those processes during implementation.

Many EAM projects spend considerable effort configuring software while giving insufficient attention to how work will actually be performed. Questions such as how work is identified, prioritised, planned, scheduled, executed, completed and reviewed are often left unresolved until late in the project. As a result, organisations go live with technically configured systems but inconsistent business practices, leading users to recreate historical workarounds within the new platform.

Business process readiness begins with understanding the current state, but it should not be constrained by it. Existing processes should be critically evaluated to determine which practices add value, which require improvement and which should be eliminated altogether. The objective is not to replicate today's processes in a new system but to design practical, sustainable ways of working that support the organisation's future operating model.

Readiness also requires that future-state processes are understood and accepted by the people expected to perform them. This includes clearly defined roles and responsibilities, decision-making authority, governance arrangements, process documentation, supporting procedures and appropriate performance measures. Importantly, organisations must distinguish between process and practice. A documented process describes how work is intended to occur, while practice reflects how work actually happens in the field. Successful implementations deliberately close the gap between the two through leadership, engagement, coaching and reinforcement.

Business process readiness should therefore be viewed as a critical organisational capability rather than a project deliverable. When people understand, accept and consistently apply the future ways of working, the EAM system becomes an enabler of improved business performance. Without this readiness, even the most sophisticated technology will automate inconsistency and reinforce existing organisational problems.

Capability maturity

Capability maturity refers to how effectively an organisation performs the business functions that an Enterprise Asset Management system is intended to support. While software provides functionality, it cannot compensate for immature business capabilities. If planning, scheduling, asset information management or maintenance governance are inconsistent before implementation, automating those practices enables the organisation to perform poor processes more efficiently.

Assessing capability maturity provides a realistic understanding of where the organisation currently operates and where to focus improvement efforts. Mature organisations typically have standardised processes, clearly defined roles, reliable asset information, performance measures and a culture of continuous improvement. Less mature organisations often rely on individual knowledge, inconsistent practices, and reactive decision-making.

An EAM implementation should not be viewed solely as a technology project but as a capability development program. The objective is not simply to replace an existing system but to improve how maintenance, operations, engineering, supply chain and asset management functions work together to achieve organisational objectives.

Capability maturity also influences implementation strategy. Organisations with lower maturity may require simpler designs, greater coaching, stronger governance, and phased deployment. More mature organisations are often able to adopt advanced functionality earlier because the supporting business disciplines already exist.

Understanding capability maturity enables implementation teams to set realistic expectations, tailor change activities, and prioritise improvement initiatives. Rather than expecting the software to create maturity, successful organisations deliberately build capability before, during and after implementation.

Change maturity

Change maturity describes an organisation's capability to successfully manage and sustain transformation. Some organisations have well-established governance, experienced change practitioners and leaders who understand how people respond to change. Others approach every project as though organisational change begins only when training is delivered shortly before go-live.

An organisation with a higher change maturity understands that change management is a strategic business discipline rather than a project activity. It invests in stakeholder engagement, communication, leadership alignment, readiness assessments, benefit realisation and continuous adoption. These organisations recognise that successful implementation extends well beyond technical deployment.

Low change maturity often results in predictable behaviours. Communication becomes reactive, resistance is viewed as obstruction rather than valuable feedback, adoption issues emerge after deployment, and projects focus heavily on technical milestones while neglecting business outcomes.

Assessing change maturity enables implementation teams to determine the level of support required throughout the program. Organisations with limited experience may require greater coaching, more structured governance and additional investment in change capability. More mature organisations can often integrate change activities naturally into existing business practices.

Improving change maturity provides benefits far beyond a single EAM implementation. It strengthens the organisation's ability to respond to future transformations, reducing implementation risk while increasing confidence across the business. As organisations become increasingly dependent on digital transformation, change maturity becomes a strategic capability in its own right.

Ask yourself how well the last change was orchestrated? Was it done from head office with PowerPoint and cyclical comms via email, or was it a deliberate set of engaging actions to help operations move forward? (Martin)

Culture

Organisational culture influences every aspect of an Enterprise Asset Management implementation. While systems define how work should be performed, culture determines how work is actually performed. It shapes attitudes towards accountability, collaboration, standardisation, leadership, innovation and continuous improvement.

Many EAM implementations underestimate the influence of culture by assuming that new processes will naturally replace existing behaviours. In reality, employees often continue operating according to established norms, regardless of what the software requires. If the culture rewards reactive maintenance, local optimisation or individual workarounds, those behaviours will continue unless deliberately addressed.

Understanding culture involves examining both visible behaviours and the underlying beliefs that drive them. Questions such as whether people trust organisational data, whether departments collaborate effectively, whether mistakes are treated as learning opportunities and whether leaders consistently reinforce expected behaviours all provide valuable insight into implementation risk.

Changing culture does not occur through communication campaigns or training sessions alone. It requires consistent leadership, aligned performance measures, appropriate governance and reinforcement over an extended period. Employees observe what leaders reward, tolerate and prioritise far more closely than what they communicate.

A successful EAM implementation works with organisational culture while progressively shaping it to support the future operating model. Sustainable transformation occurs when new behaviours become accepted as the normal way of working rather than simply complying with project requirements.

Political landscape

Every organisation has a political landscape comprising formal authority, informal influence, competing priorities, and individual interests. Ignoring these dynamics does

not eliminate them; it simply increases the likelihood that they will disrupt the implementation at critical moments.

Enterprise Asset Management projects often span multiple departments including operations, maintenance, engineering, finance, procurement and information technology. Each group brings different objectives, measures of success and historical experiences. Without careful stakeholder management, these differences can evolve into competing agendas that delay decisions and reduce organisational alignment.

Understanding the political landscape means identifying influential stakeholders, recognising potential sources of resistance and appreciating where organisational power truly resides. Often, the individuals with the greatest influence are not those with the highest job titles, but those trusted by their peers and respected for their operational knowledge.

Political awareness should never be confused with political manipulation. Effective organisational change management uses this understanding to build consensus, encourage collaboration and resolve conflict before it escalates. Transparent governance, clear decision-making authority and active executive sponsorship all help reduce unnecessary political friction.

Projects that acknowledge organisational politics are better equipped to manage stakeholder expectations, build support coalitions, and maintain momentum throughout implementation. Those that ignore political realities frequently find that technical progress stalls because organisational alignment has not been achieved.

Competing initiatives

Enterprise Asset Management implementations rarely occur in isolation. Most organisations are simultaneously managing multiple transformation programs including ERP upgrades, cybersecurity improvements, regulatory compliance activities, restructures, operational excellence programs and digital initiatives. Each project competes for the same people, resources and leadership attention.

Competing initiatives can significantly reduce an organisation's ability to successfully adopt new ways of working. Subject matter experts become unavailable, leaders divide their attention among multiple priorities, and employees receive conflicting messages about what is most important. Even well-managed projects can struggle if organisational capacity is not carefully considered.

Understanding competing initiatives allows implementation teams to develop realistic schedules and identify opportunities for alignment. Some initiatives may complement the EAM program, while others may create unnecessary duplication or conflict. Coordinated planning enables organisations to reduce disruption and maximise the value of multiple investments.

Change management therefore extends beyond the boundaries of a single project. It requires a portfolio perspective that considers the cumulative impact of change across the entire organisation. Executive governance plays a critical role in balancing priorities and ensuring that transformation efforts reinforce rather than compete with one another.

Successful EAM implementations recognise that organisational capacity is finite. Planning for competing initiatives is not simply a scheduling exercise; it is an essential component of building sustainable organisational readiness.

Change saturation

Every organisation has a finite capacity to absorb change. Change saturation occurs when the volume, complexity or pace of transformation exceeds that capacity. When this happens, even well-designed initiatives begin to experience declining engagement, increased resistance and reduced adoption.

Change saturation is often misunderstood as employee resistance. In reality, employees may fully support the objectives of multiple projects but lack the time, energy and cognitive capacity to successfully implement them all. Fatigue, frustration and declining productivity become natural responses to continual organisational disruption.

Within an Enterprise Asset Management implementation, change saturation can manifest in many ways. Training attendance declines, communications are ignored, business participation reduces, decision-making slows, and project teams struggle to maintain momentum. These symptoms frequently indicate organisational overload rather than poor project execution.

Monitoring change saturation requires ongoing engagement with leaders and employees. Surveys, readiness assessments, stakeholder interviews and workload analysis all provide valuable insight into organisational capacity. Where saturation is identified, leaders may need to adjust deployment schedules, reallocate resources or simplify implementation activities to reduce pressure on the business.

Managing change saturation is ultimately about respecting the human side of transformation. Successful organisations recognise that sustainable adoption depends not only on the quality of the solution but also on the organisation's ability to embrace change without becoming overwhelmed. Long-term success is achieved by pacing transformation appropriately rather than attempting to deliver every improvement simultaneously.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Readiness is determined by people, culture, leadership and capability, not project schedules.	Operational readiness should include assessment of procedural, technical and safety impacts.
Change maturity differs across business units and should not be assumed to be consistent.	Readiness reviews should confirm that required approvals and governance mechanisms are in place.
Leadership readiness is often more important than workforce readiness.	Asset-related changes should not proceed until operational controls are confirmed.
Organisations experiencing change saturation require additional support rather than additional communication.	Temporary project controls should not compromise existing operational management systems.

Digital literacy significantly influences confidence in adopting new technologies.	Changes to operational responsibilities should be formally authorised before implementation.
Readiness assessments should drive action plans rather than produce reports.	Effective readiness reduces operational risk during deployment and transition.

Over the years I've become cautious whenever someone says, "We're ready." Readiness isn't determined by a completed checklist or a planned go-live date. The organisation demonstrates, through evidence, that it can operate safely under its new conditions. Governance is functioning. Decision-makers understand their responsibilities. Information can be trusted. Operational leaders are prepared to own the outcome. I've learnt that organisations rarely fail. After all, they lacked the technology; they struggled because they overestimated their readiness to operate differently. In that respect, all stakeholders must understand what will happen in the days, weeks, and months ahead as governance, reporting and new accountabilities kick in. For instance, if a new model for data governance begins, are the existing stakeholders 'comfortable' that this function has moved, and are the new stakeholders accountable for this function ready to begin (Martin)

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Define
Also Supports	Discover, Design
Why it matters	Readiness assessments identify capability gaps that influence both planning and future solution design.

Chapter 6 - Defining Success

One of the simplest yet most powerful questions any organisation can ask before embarking on an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) transformation is, "What does good look like?" Surprisingly, many organisations struggle to answer it with confidence. They know they want a modern EAM platform, improved maintenance performance, or better asset information, but they cannot clearly articulate what success will look like once the project is complete. Without this shared vision, every stakeholder develops their own definition of success. The project team celebrates delivering the system; IT celebrates technical stability; finance looks for cost savings; while operations wants work to be easier. Organisational Change Management (OCM) exists to bring these perspectives together into a common definition of success that everyone understands, supports and works towards.

Asking "What does good look like?" should not be limited to technology. It should be asked across every dimension of the organisation. What does good leadership look like? What does good planning look like? What does good asset data look like? What does good decision-making, governance, culture, training, communication,

collaboration and user adoption look like? Even more importantly, what do these look like after the project team has left and the business has returned to Business as Usual? Defining these future-state characteristics provides the benchmark against which progress can be measured and allows the organisation to move beyond simply implementing software to genuinely transforming how it manages its assets.

What does good look like?

The topics in this chapter build upon that fundamental question. They explore how organisations define success in terms of business outcomes, strategic objectives, measurable performance indicators, and realised benefits, rather than relying solely on project milestones. Together, they provide the framework for linking organisational change activities to business value, ensuring that every communication, every leadership conversation, every training activity, and every behavioural change contributes to a clearly defined and measurable vision of success. In the end, the most successful EAM implementations are not those that deliver a system; they are those where the organisation can confidently answer the question, "Is this what good looks like?", with evidence rather than opinion.

One question I've learnt to ask early in every transformation is, "How will we know we've succeeded twelve months after go-live?" It's surprising how often the conversation shifts. Success stops being measured by milestones and starts being measured by operational performance. Are better decisions being made? Is governance stronger? Is information trusted? Are business owners leading continuous improvement? From a Management of Change perspective, success isn't when the project finishes; it's when the organisation no longer needs the project to sustain the new way of working. (Peter)

Business outcomes

One of the earliest responsibilities of Organisational Change Management (OCM) in an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation is helping the organisation define what success actually looks like. Too often, projects define success as delivering software on time and within budget. While these are important project management measures, they say very little about whether the organisation has changed its behaviours, improved its decision-making or realised the value that justified the investment in the first place.

Success in an EAM transformation should be defined in terms of business performance, operational capability and sustained behavioural change. An organisation that has successfully implemented an EAM platform is not simply using new technology; it is planning work more effectively, making better maintenance decisions, improving the quality of asset information, and embedding consistent business processes across the enterprise. OCM plays a critical role in ensuring these outcomes become part of normal operations rather than remaining project aspirations.

Defining success requires collaboration between executives, operational leaders, asset managers, maintenance teams, finance, information management and project stakeholders. Each group will view success through a different lens, and OCM helps create a shared understanding that aligns local objectives with enterprise goals. This alignment provides a common language for decision-making throughout the implementation.

Most importantly, success should be measurable, observable and sustainable. If improvements disappear once project support concludes, genuine organisational change has not occurred. The ultimate measure of success is not system adoption alone, but the organisation's ability to consistently operate differently, make better decisions and continuously improve long after the project has been completed.

Strategic objectives

Strategic objectives define why an organisation is investing in Enterprise Asset Management and how the initiative supports broader corporate priorities. An EAM implementation should never exist as an isolated technology project; it should directly contribute to the organisation's long-term strategic direction.

Organisational Change Management ensures that employees understand this connection. When people recognise how changes to daily work support organisational strategy, they are more likely to understand the purpose of the change and commit to adopting new behaviours. This creates engagement that extends beyond compliance with project requirements.

Strategic objectives may include improving asset performance, increasing operational resilience, reducing enterprise risk, supporting sustainable growth, extending asset life, enhancing customer service, improving financial stewardship or enabling digital transformation. Every project decision should be traceable back to one or more strategic objectives.

One of OCM's key responsibilities is maintaining this strategic alignment throughout the project lifecycle. As priorities shift or difficult decisions arise, the agreed strategic objectives provide the framework for evaluating options and resolving competing interests. They also help prevent unnecessary customisations or local process variations that deliver limited enterprise value.

When strategic objectives remain visible throughout implementation, they provide a consistent narrative that reinforces leadership messaging, supports change communications and reminds stakeholders that the project is about transforming organisational capability rather than simply deploying new software.

SMART objectives

Ambitious aspirations alone do not deliver successful organisational change. To measure progress effectively, desired outcomes must be translated into SMART outcomes: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound. Within OCM, SMART outcomes provide the practical mechanism for demonstrating whether behavioural and organisational change is actually occurring.

Specific outcomes eliminate ambiguity by clearly describing the expected improvement. Measurable outcomes establish objective indicators that allow progress to be tracked. Achievable outcomes recognise organisational capability and maturity, ensuring expectations remain realistic. Relevant outcomes align directly with business priorities and strategic objectives, while Time-bound outcomes establish accountability through defined delivery timeframes.

For example, rather than stating "improve work management," a SMART outcome might be "increase planned maintenance compliance from 65% to 85% within twelve months of go-live." Similarly, "improve data quality" becomes "reduce critical asset data errors by 90% within six months through new governance and validation processes."

SMART outcomes also support change governance by providing objective evidence of progress. Steering committees, executive sponsors and business leaders can monitor implementation success using agreed measures rather than relying on anecdotal feedback or perceptions.

Perhaps most importantly, SMART outcomes reinforce that successful organisational change is not measured by completing project activities but by achieving demonstrable improvements in organisational performance and behaviour.

KPIs

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) provide the measurable evidence that organisational change is delivering the intended business outcomes. Within an EAM implementation, KPIs should extend beyond traditional project measures and include indicators that demonstrate adoption, capability development, process performance and business improvement.

OCM works closely with business leaders to identify KPIs that reflect both operational performance and behavioural change. While technical implementation metrics may indicate whether the system is functioning, OCM-related KPIs demonstrate whether people are using it effectively and consistently.

Examples include planning compliance, schedule compliance, preventive maintenance completion, work order quality, asset data completeness, backlog health, inventory accuracy, first-time fix rates, user adoption, training effectiveness and workflow compliance. These indicators help determine whether new business processes are becoming embedded across the organisation.

KPIs should be established before implementation begins to enable baseline performance measurement. Without understanding current performance, organisations cannot objectively demonstrate improvement or calculate realised benefits following deployment.

Effective KPIs are regularly reviewed, understood by stakeholders and linked directly to organisational decision-making. Rather than becoming passive reporting metrics, they should drive continuous improvement, reinforce accountability and encourage leaders to actively support ongoing behavioural change after project completion.

Lead and Lag Measures

Many organisations measure success only after results have already occurred. While lag measures are important, they often identify problems too late for corrective action. OCM therefore encourages organisations to monitor both lead and lag measures throughout an EAM implementation.

Lag measures describe outcomes that have already been achieved. Examples include reduced maintenance costs, improved asset availability, reduced downtime, regulatory compliance, improved return on investment, and improved reliability. These measures confirm whether business objectives have ultimately been realised.

Lead measures, by contrast, monitor behaviours and activities that influence future performance. They provide early warning indicators that organisational change is progressing or failing, before business outcomes are affected. Examples include training completion, leadership engagement, process compliance, planning quality, supervisor coaching, data quality improvements, adoption of standard work practices and participation in change activities.

Lead measures are particularly valuable because they can be influenced directly by project teams and business leaders during implementation. If adoption begins to decline or process compliance deteriorates, corrective action can be taken before lag measures reveal deteriorating business performance.

Successful OCM programmes use lead measures to proactively manage change, while lag measures confirm that sustained organisational improvements have been achieved.

Benefits

Benefits represent the measurable improvements realised because organisational change has been successfully embedded. They justify the original investment in Enterprise Asset Management and demonstrate that the project has delivered value beyond mere technology implementation.

Benefits can be financial, operational, strategic, regulatory or cultural. Financial benefits may include reduced maintenance expenditure, lower inventory holdings, improved asset utilisation and deferred capital replacement. Operational benefits may involve improved planning efficiency, greater schedule compliance, reduced downtime and enhanced workforce productivity. Strategic benefits often include improved decision-making, better asset investment planning and stronger organisational resilience.

OCM plays an essential role in benefit realisation because benefits are ultimately created by people changing how they work. A perfectly configured system delivers little value if planners continue using spreadsheets, supervisors bypass workflows or asset information remains poorly maintained. Sustainable benefits only emerge when new behaviours become standard organisational practice.

Benefits should be clearly assigned to business owners rather than left to the project team. Once implementation concludes, operational leaders become accountable for sustaining the changes necessary to maintain realised value.

Benefit realisation should therefore continue well beyond go-live. Organisations that actively monitor, review and reinforce benefits are far more likely to achieve the return on investment originally promised in the business case.

Value drivers

Value drivers are the organisational capabilities and behaviours that create measurable business value from an Enterprise Asset Management implementation. While benefits describe the outcomes achieved, value drivers explain the mechanisms that generate those outcomes. Understanding this distinction is fundamental to effective Organisational Change Management.

Typical value drivers include improved work planning, standardised maintenance processes, higher-quality asset data, stronger governance, increased workforce capability, effective leadership, better decision-making, consistent risk management, and greater collaboration across operational functions. These drivers influence virtually every benefit expected from the implementation.

OCM focuses on strengthening these value drivers by developing the organisational capability needed to support them. Training builds competence, communication creates understanding, leadership reinforces expectations, governance establishes accountability, and change reinforcement embeds new behaviours into everyday operations.

Importantly, value drivers are interconnected. High-quality asset information supports better planning, improves schedule compliance, enhances asset reliability, and ultimately reduces operational costs. Weakness in any one value driver can reduce the overall value delivered by the EAM programme.

By identifying, measuring and actively managing value drivers throughout implementation, organisations move beyond software deployment and create the organisational capability required to sustain business performance improvements for many years after project completion.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Success should be defined by business outcomes rather than successful software deployment.	Success includes maintaining safe and compliant operations throughout the change process.
Measures should include behavioural indicators alongside traditional project metrics.	Performance measures should confirm operational effectiveness after changes are introduced.
Benefits realisation begins during planning, not after go-live.	Operational KPIs should demonstrate that change has not adversely affected asset performance.

Lead indicators provide earlier insight into adoption than lag indicators alone.	Post-implementation reviews should verify that operational risks remain effectively controlled.
Different stakeholder groups define success differently, and all perspectives matter.	Success includes preserving configuration integrity and information accuracy.
Sustainable success is achieved when improved behaviours become the norm in business practice.	Every completed change should demonstrate that governance objectives have been achieved alongside business objectives.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Define
Also Supports	Deliver, Depart
Why it matters	Success measures established early become the basis for adoption, benefits realisation and continuous improvement.

I've learnt that projects are often won or lost long before design workshops begin. The organisations that invest time understanding their readiness, defining success and building a genuine case for change almost always navigate implementation with greater confidence. Readiness isn't something you measure once; it evolves as the organisation learns, adapts and becomes more confident.

One of the biggest lessons for me has been that people rarely commit to someone else's vision. They commit when they help create it. That's why I believe readiness is built through conversations, engagement and shared ownership rather than project plans and status reports. (Martin)

I've always believed that strong foundations are built through disciplined governance and thoughtful planning. Before organisations begin changing systems or processes, they need confidence that operational risks have been identified, that responsibilities are understood, and that decision-making structures are in place.

Good preparation isn't about slowing projects down. It gives organisations the confidence to move quickly because everyone understands the rules within which change will occur. I've found that the strongest implementations rarely need heroic recoveries because they invested in getting the fundamentals right from the beginning. One habit I've developed is asking a simple question at the beginning of every programme: "How will we know we've succeeded twelve months after go-live?" It's surprising how often the room becomes quiet. Most projects define success around implementation milestones. Very few define success in terms of better decisions, improved performance, or stronger organisational capability. For me, success is when the business no longer talks about the project because the new way of working has become the organisation's operating model. (Peter)

Part Three - Understanding the Organisation

Understanding the organisation is the foundation of every successful Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation. Before defining future processes, configuring software, or designing training, it is essential to understand how the organisation actually operates today. This extends well beyond organisational charts and documented procedures. It includes understanding the decisions people make, the relationships they rely upon, the shortcuts they use, the systems they trust, and the culture that influences every aspect of work.

One of the greatest mistakes organisations make is assuming that understanding the current state is primarily a technical exercise. Business analysts often document workflows while solution architects map system interfaces, yet the human dimensions are frequently overlooked. Organisational Change Management (OCM) seeks to understand why people work the way they do, while Management of Change (MoC) seeks to ensure that any modifications to operational risk are properly assessed and controlled. These are complementary but fundamentally different disciplines.

OCM asks questions such as:

- Why do planners avoid certain workflows?
- Why do supervisors maintain shadow spreadsheets?
- Which decisions are driven by culture rather than policy?
- What historical experiences have shaped current behaviours?
- Where do people distrust existing systems?

Management of Change asks different questions:

- Does changing this process introduce new operational risks?
- Have hazards been identified?
- Are engineering controls affected?
- Have safety approvals been obtained?
- Has operational risk been formally assessed?

Both perspectives are essential. OCM focuses on organisational adoption and business capability, while MoC protects operational integrity and safety during change. Confusing these disciplines often results in projects that either ignore human adoption or fail to adequately manage operational risk.

Understanding the organisation, therefore, is not about documenting how work is supposed to occur. It is about discovering how work actually happens and recognising that sustainable transformation begins with understanding reality before attempting to redesign it.

Chapter 7 - Understanding "As Is"

Every EAM project speaks enthusiastically about the future "To Be" environment, yet many implementations never develop a genuine understanding of the existing "As Is" organisation. Instead, assumptions are made based upon documented procedures,

workshops with management, or software demonstrations. Unfortunately, these sources rarely reflect operational reality.

The purpose of understanding the "As Is" state is not to preserve current practices. Rather, it provides the evidence required to determine what should be retained, improved, standardised or eliminated. Without this understanding, organisations risk replacing efficient local practices with poorly designed standard processes or introducing technology that solves problems that never actually existed.

From an OCM perspective, understanding the current state means understanding:

- how work actually flows through the business
- how people collaborate
- where workarounds exist
- how decisions are made
- which practices employees genuinely value

This provides the foundation for designing change that people can realistically adopt.

Management of Change has a different focus. When operational processes are altered, the organisation must determine whether those changes affect safety, environmental controls, asset integrity or regulatory compliance. The "As Is" state therefore becomes the baseline against which operational risks are assessed.

OCM asks: "How will people transition from today's ways of working to tomorrow's?"

MoC asks: "Does changing today's operational method introduce unacceptable risk?"

These questions are related but not interchangeable.

Organisations that skip a rigorous understanding of the current state often discover implementation issues late in the project when users begin resisting new processes because critical aspects of their daily work were never understood in the first place.

Current processes

Current processes describe how work is intended to move through the organisation. They include maintenance planning, work management, procurement, inventory, engineering, inspections, shutdowns, capital projects and countless supporting activities. Unfortunately, documented processes frequently bear little resemblance to operational reality.

Many organisations possess beautifully documented process maps that nobody actually follows. Over time, practical adjustments are introduced to overcome system limitations, staffing shortages, organisational silos and historical decisions. The result is that "the process" and "the way work gets done" become two different things.

Organisational Change Management is interested in understanding both.

OCM explores:

- Which process steps create frustration?
- Which approvals add little value?

- Where do people routinely bypass procedures?
- Which activities depend upon personal knowledge rather than organisational capability?
- Which process variations exist across different sites?

This understanding informs future process design and adoption planning.

Management of Change becomes relevant when operational procedures themselves are modified. Altering maintenance methods, inspection frequencies, isolation procedures, or engineering workflows may introduce operational risks that require a formal hazard assessment and approval.

OCM improves organisational capability.

MoC protects operational safety.

Successful EAM implementations recognise that improving processes is not simply about automation. It is about designing practical ways of working that people can consistently follow, while ensuring operational risks are effectively managed throughout the transition.

Current behaviours

Technology rarely changes behaviour by itself. Organisations change when people choose to work differently. Understanding current behaviours is therefore considerably more important than understanding software functionality.

Behaviour reflects culture, incentives, leadership, history and experience. Two organisations using identical EAM systems can achieve vastly different outcomes because their behavioural norms differ significantly.

OCM examines behaviours such as:

- how supervisors prioritise work
- how planners interact with maintenance teams
- whether data is entered immediately or retrospectively
- how people respond to KPIs
- how decisions are escalated
- levels of trust across departments

These behavioural patterns determine how successfully new systems will be adopted.

Management of Change, meanwhile, focuses on behavioural changes that could influence operational safety. If new procedures require operators or maintainers to perform tasks differently, MoC ensures that competency, hazards and controls have been adequately considered before implementation.

OCM asks: "How do we help people develop new behaviours?"

MoC asks: "Are these behavioural changes operationally safe?"

One develops organisational capability.

The other manages operational risk.

Recognising this distinction prevents organisations from assuming that user training alone constitutes effective change management.

Current culture

Culture represents the shared beliefs, assumptions and unwritten rules that shape organisational behaviour. It influences every EAM implementation, whether leaders actively acknowledge it or not.

Many projects underestimate culture because it cannot be configured inside software. Yet culture determines whether people trust new systems, collaborate across departments, challenge poor practices and embrace continuous improvement.

Organisational Change Management seeks to understand:

- attitudes towards change
- leadership credibility
- accountability
- collaboration
- willingness to standardise
- historical project experiences
- organisational resilience

Culture determines how quickly change is accepted.

Management of Change generally does not seek to change organisational culture directly. Instead, it ensures that safety culture remains strong during operational changes. A healthy reporting culture, adherence to procedures and disciplined operational practice remain essential components of effective MoC.

OCM seeks cultural evolution.

MoC seeks operational discipline.

Both matter enormously, but they address different organisational objectives.

Ignoring culture is one of the primary reasons technically successful EAM implementations fail to deliver expected business outcomes.

Current systems

Few organisations operate a single technology platform. Most medium and large organisations have dozens, or even hundreds, of interconnected applications supporting maintenance, finance, procurement, engineering, operations, GIS, SCADA, document management, HR, and analytics.

Understanding the current systems landscape involves much more than creating an application inventory. It requires understanding which systems people actually trust, where duplicate information exists, and why users continue to rely on legacy tools.

OCM examines:

- user confidence
- perceived usability
- shadow systems
- spreadsheet dependence
- duplicate data entry
- manual workarounds
- system ownership

These insights directly influence adoption planning.

Management of Change becomes relevant when modifying systems that influence operational control, safety or engineering decision-making. System changes affecting operational risk frequently require formal review before implementation.

OCM manages people's relationship with technology.

MoC manages the operational consequences of technological change.

Successful EAM implementations therefore recognise that replacing software is relatively easy; changing people's confidence in technology requires considerably greater effort.

Current governance

Governance defines how decisions are made, who owns processes, how priorities are established and how accountability operates throughout the organisation.

Weak governance is one of the most common causes of EAM implementation failure. Projects frequently focus on configuring workflows while overlooking decision-making structures that ultimately determine whether those workflows are consistently followed.

OCM evaluates governance by examining:

- decision authority
- executive sponsorship
- process ownership
- accountability
- escalation pathways
- cross-functional collaboration
- policy alignment

Without governance, sustainable change rarely survives beyond project completion.

Management of Change introduces formal governance specifically around operational changes. This includes approval workflows, engineering reviews, hazard assessments, regulatory obligations and documented authorisations.

OCM governance asks: "Who owns organisational change?"

MoC governance asks: "Who approves operational risk?"

These governance models intersect but serve fundamentally different purposes.

Strong EAM implementations deliberately establish governance structures that support both organisational transformation and safe operational change.

Current pain points

Every organisation has frustrations that employees experience daily. These pain points often become the strongest drivers for change, provided they are properly understood.

Common examples include:

- excessive manual data entry
- poor work visibility
- duplicated effort
- unreliable asset information
- lengthy approval processes
- reactive maintenance
- inconsistent reporting

OCM seeks to understand not merely what the problems are, but also how they affect people's motivation, workload, and willingness to adopt change.

Management of Change focuses on pain points that may represent operational risk. Equipment failures, procedural weaknesses or unsafe work practices require formal assessment before changes are introduced.

OCM uses pain points to build the case for change.

MoC uses operational issues to assess risk and determine appropriate controls.

The distinction matters because not every organisational frustration represents a safety issue, and not every safety issue is solved solely through organisational change.

I have often found it interesting that many projects assume, brush over or ignore the pain points. These are the anchors for discussion, process redesign and demonstrated collaboration with the business and stakeholders. Ignoring them as a warning signal will come back to bite you. (Martin)

Current informal work practices

Perhaps the greatest source of organisational knowledge exists outside documented procedures. Informal work practices are the unofficial methods people develop to complete work efficiently despite system limitations or organisational complexity.

Examples include:

- personal spreadsheets
- whiteboards
- unofficial approval pathways
- verbal work requests
- local coding standards

- undocumented planning methods
- handwritten notes
- experienced staff acting as human system integrations

These practices often emerge because official processes fail to meet operational needs.

Organisational Change Management actively seeks to uncover these hidden practices, not to criticise them but to understand why they exist. Many represent practical innovations that should inform future process design, while others expose weaknesses that need to be addressed.

Management of Change is primarily concerned when informal practices bypass approved operational controls or create unmanaged safety risks. In these situations, formal risk assessment and governance are essential before any transition.

OCM asks, "Why do people work this way?"

MoC asks, "Does this way of working introduce unacceptable operational risk?"

Ignoring informal practices almost guarantees resistance during an EAM implementation because projects end up redesigning documented processes rather than the work people actually perform every day.

Current data quality

Data quality is one of the strongest predictors of EAM success, yet it is often treated as a technical migration issue rather than an organisational capability. Asset hierarchies, equipment records, bills of materials, maintenance history and failure codes all underpin effective planning, reliability and decision-making. Poor data leads to poor outcomes, regardless of how capable the software may be.

Organisational Change Management views data quality through the lens of behaviour and accountability. It asks why data is incomplete, why standards are inconsistently applied, whether people understand the value of accurate information, and who is responsible for maintaining it over time. Data quality problems are often symptoms of broader organisational issues, such as unclear ownership, inadequate training, competing priorities, or a culture that prioritises getting the job done over properly recording the work. Improving data quality, therefore, requires changing habits, reinforcing expectations, and building a culture in which information is recognised as a business asset rather than an administrative burden.

Management of Change approaches data differently. Where changes to asset information, engineering records, or operating parameters could affect safety, compliance, or asset integrity, MoC ensures that those changes are reviewed, authorised, and traceable. The concern is not simply whether the data is accurate, but whether altering critical information could introduce operational risk.

OCM asks, "How do we build a culture that values high-quality data?"

MoC asks, "Does changing this information create operational risk that must be assessed and controlled?"

The distinction is significant. OCM improves the organisational capability to create and sustain quality data, while MoC ensures that changes to critical information do not compromise safe and reliable operations. Organisations that recognise both perspectives are far more likely to achieve long-term value from their EAM investment, because they understand that trusted data is as much a people issue as it is a technical one.

When discussing data quality, be careful not to necessarily associate data quality with the "quality of operations". There can be multiple reasons for low data quality, most of which have little to do with people. (Martin)

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Understanding the current state begins with listening rather than assuming.	Existing operational practices should be understood before proposing changes.
Current behaviours often reveal more than documented procedures.	Critical operational processes should be mapped to understand potential impacts of change.
Culture influences how work is performed, regardless of organisational charts or policies.	Changes affecting asset operation or maintenance require structured assessment and approval.
Informal work practices usually exist because they solve real operational problems.	Understanding current controls helps ensure they are not inadvertently removed.
People are often experts in navigating organisational complexity that is invisible to projects.	Existing risks and safeguards should be documented before introducing new processes.
Effective discovery builds trust by demonstrating genuine curiosity about how the business operates.	Operational knowledge should inform future governance decisions rather than be replaced by project assumptions.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Discover
Also Supports	Define
Why it matters	Understanding how work is actually performed provides the baseline for meaningful organisational change.

Some of the most valuable insights I have gained did not come from workshops. They came from standing beside planners, supervisors, and frontline teams as they explained why the documented process did not reflect how work was actually performed.

Every workaround tells a story: poor system design, historical decisions or an organisation adapting to keep work moving.

Unless those reasons are understood, the future state may remove useful controls, retain hidden risks or recreate the same problems in a new system. (Peter)

Chapter 8 - Understanding the Organisation Beyond Process Maps

Every organisation has process maps. They describe how work is intended to flow, who performs each activity, where decisions are made and how information should move through the business. They are an important foundation for designing an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) solution, but they are rarely the complete picture. The reality is that organisations are made up of people, and people adapt. Over time, they develop practical ways to overcome obstacles, compensate for system limitations, manage risk, and get the job done. Some of these practices strengthen the organisation, while others introduce inconsistency, inefficiency or hidden risk. Understanding the difference is one of the most valuable contributions Organisational Change Management can make.

One of the first responsibilities of an Organisational Change Management practitioner is to understand what is truly important to the organisation before recommending change. That priority will not be the same for every business. A highly commercial organisation may naturally optimise for profitability, productivity and operational efficiency. Success is measured through financial performance, production targets and shareholder value. In contrast, organisations operating in highly regulated industries such as utilities, defence, aviation, healthcare or mining may prioritise safety, environmental protection, regulatory compliance and operational integrity over short-term financial outcomes. While commercial performance remains important, decisions are often made through the lens of risk management, compliance and public accountability.

This context matters because it explains why people work the way they do. A local spreadsheet, an informal approval process or a whiteboard covered in maintenance activities may not exist because employees are resisting change; they may exist because those tools help the organisation achieve what it values most. Equally, some workarounds may have evolved for personal convenience rather than organisational benefit, creating unnecessary complexity and reducing trust in enterprise information. Most behaviours sit somewhere between these two extremes.

The following topics encourage practitioners to move beyond documented processes and to understand the organisation's operational reality. They explore the unofficial systems, local knowledge, experience and practical workarounds that often determine whether an EAM implementation succeeds or struggles. Rather than asking, "What does the process say?", effective Organisational Change Management asks, "Why do people work this way, and what is the organisation trying to achieve?" Only by understanding what the organisation truly values can future ways of working be designed that are both operationally practical and aligned with the outcomes the business is seeking to deliver.

How work actually gets done

One of the greatest mistakes in an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation is assuming that documented process maps accurately reflect how

work is performed. In reality, process maps often describe how managers believe work should be done rather than how employees actually deliver outcomes every day. They provide a theoretical blueprint, but they rarely capture the countless decisions, exceptions, shortcuts, and collaborative behaviours that allow operations to continue under real-world conditions.

Organisational Change Management must therefore look beyond documented workflows and seek to understand operational reality. Maintenance planners may bypass formal approval processes to respond to an urgent breakdown. Operators may call a trusted supervisor rather than raising a formal request. Stores personnel may reserve critical spare parts through an informal conversation rather than relying on system transactions. None of these activities appears on a process map, yet they may be essential to maintaining production, ensuring safety or achieving service levels.

Importantly, these behaviours are not always examples of poor compliance. Sometimes they exist because the formal process is inefficient, outdated or incapable of supporting operational demands. Other times, they emerge simply because experienced employees have discovered faster, more effective ways to achieve the desired outcome. In other situations, shortcuts are taken for personal convenience, creating risk, inconsistency, and poor data quality.

The role of Organisational Change Management is not to eliminate every informal practice, but to understand why it exists. Every workaround tells a story. It may reveal a broken process, a missing capability, an organisational constraint or an opportunity for improvement. By understanding how work actually gets done, change practitioners can design future processes that are practical, trusted and sustainable rather than theoretically perfect but operationally unusable.

Shadow systems

Shadow systems are the unofficial tools, databases and applications developed outside the organisation's approved technology environment to compensate for perceived shortcomings in enterprise systems. While they are often viewed negatively from a governance perspective, they usually emerge because people need information or functionality that official systems cannot easily provide.

From an Organisational Change Management perspective, shadow systems should be treated as valuable evidence rather than simply governance problems. They reveal where users have lost confidence in existing systems, where reporting is inadequate or where business processes fail to support operational needs. Eliminating shadow systems without addressing the underlying cause encourages new ones to emerge.

During an EAM implementation, organisations often discover dozens, or even hundreds, of locally developed solutions that individual departments depend on every day. These systems may contain asset histories, maintenance schedules, contractor information, financial tracking or operational intelligence that has never been incorporated into enterprise platforms.

Understanding why these systems exist enables project teams to determine whether the capability should be incorporated into the new EAM solution, whether business

processes need redesign, or whether users require better training and support. Organisational Change Management therefore focuses less on the technology itself and more on the organisational behaviours that created it.

Excel

Few tools have shaped operational work more than Microsoft Excel. In almost every asset-intensive organisation, spreadsheets have evolved far beyond simple calculations to become planning systems, reporting platforms, scheduling tools, budgeting applications and unofficial asset registers.

The existence of large numbers of spreadsheets should never be dismissed as poor discipline. Instead, they often indicate that people have been forced to create flexible solutions where enterprise systems lack functionality, accessibility or usability. Excel provides speed, familiarity and complete local control qualities that enterprise applications sometimes struggle to match.

From a change management perspective, every critical spreadsheet should be investigated before migration. Why does it exist? Who depends upon it? What business decision does it support? What risks would arise if it disappeared tomorrow?

Many spreadsheets will ultimately become unnecessary as EAM capabilities mature. Others may represent legitimate business requirements that should be incorporated into reporting, dashboards or planning tools. The objective is not to wage war on Excel but to understand the business value it currently provides and ensure that value is preserved within future ways of working.

Emails

Email is often viewed simply as a communication tool, yet within many organisations it has quietly become part of the operational process itself. Work requests, approvals, maintenance instructions, contractor coordination, purchasing decisions, and asset information are frequently exchanged via email rather than through enterprise systems.

Process maps rarely acknowledge this reality. They may show approvals occurring within workflow applications, while in practice managers reply "Approved" to an email or verbally authorise work before someone later updates the system. The documented process and the operational process become two entirely different things.

Organisational Change Management seeks to understand why email has become embedded in operational practice. Is the formal workflow too slow? Are mobile users unable to easily access enterprise systems? Do approval processes fail to reflect operational urgency?

Rather than criticising users for relying on email, change practitioners should identify the organisational conditions that encouraged its use. Future processes should preserve the speed and simplicity people value while ensuring that decisions, approvals, and asset information are visible within enterprise systems, where governance, reporting, and compliance can be maintained.

Local Databases

Across many organisations, departments develop their own local databases to manage information they consider critical but inadequately supported by corporate systems. These databases may contain inspection records, shutdown planning, contractor qualifications, specialised asset information or operational histories accumulated over many years.

Although they often create duplication and governance concerns, local databases usually exist because they solve genuine operational problems. They frequently become trusted sources of information because they have evolved alongside the people performing the work rather than being imposed through enterprise projects.

An EAM implementation that replaces local databases without understanding their purpose risks losing valuable organisational knowledge. Some contain business rules that have never been formally documented. Others support specialised activities that standard enterprise processes overlook.

Organisational Change Management therefore investigates not only the data contained within these databases but also the behaviours and business needs that led people to create them. Understanding these motivations enables organisations to design enterprise solutions that people willingly adopt because they genuinely support the work being performed.

Whiteboards

Few artefacts reveal operational reality better than the humble whiteboard. Despite sophisticated enterprise applications, many maintenance teams continue to rely on whiteboards to coordinate daily work, manage outages, allocate resources and communicate changing priorities.

Whiteboards succeed because they are visible, collaborative and immediately adaptable. Everyone can see the current situation, contribute to discussions and adjust plans as operational conditions change. They support conversation as much as information management.

From an Organisational Change Management perspective, the continued use of whiteboards should not automatically be interpreted as resistance to digital systems. Instead, they often highlight capabilities that enterprise software has failed to replicate, particularly around team collaboration and visual planning.

Rather than insisting that whiteboards disappear, organisations should understand the operational value they provide. Digital planning tools should seek to preserve the same visibility, flexibility and collaborative decision-making that made the whiteboard indispensable in the first place.

Experience

Experienced employees carry enormous amounts of organisational knowledge that never appears in procedures, process maps or system documentation. They know which equipment regularly fails after heavy rain, which contractor consistently delivers

quality work, which spare parts are interchangeable and which informal relationships accelerate problem resolution.

This experience often bridges the gap between documented process and operational reality. When formal procedures fail to address unusual situations, experienced people rely on judgement developed over years of practical application.

Organisational Change Management recognises that implementations should not simply digitise documented processes but also capture critical operational knowledge before experienced personnel retire or move elsewhere. Structured workshops, observations and interviews help transform tacit knowledge into organisational capability.

Ultimately, successful EAM implementations do not replace experience; they provide systems that enable experience to be shared more consistently across the organisation.

Local knowledge

Every operational site develops knowledge that is unique to its environment. Local teams understand the personalities, geography, environmental conditions, operational history and practical constraints that influence daily work. This knowledge rarely exists in corporate documentation but significantly shapes how work is performed.

Corporate process maps often assume standardisation across sites, yet local realities frequently require variation. Different asset types, workforce capabilities, contractor availability and environmental conditions all influence how processes are applied.

Organisational Change Management must recognise where standardisation creates value and where local flexibility remains appropriate. Ignoring local knowledge in pursuit of absolute consistency often generates resistance because people feel practical realities are being overlooked.

Understanding local knowledge enables organisations to design enterprise processes that establish consistent governance while still allowing sufficient flexibility for different operational environments.

Operational workarounds

Operational workarounds are among the richest sources of organisational insight. Every workaround exists because someone encountered a barrier preventing work from being completed efficiently. Rather than stopping, they developed an alternative method that enabled operations to continue.

Some workarounds improve organisational performance by overcoming unnecessary bureaucracy, inefficient systems or outdated procedures. Others introduce significant risk by bypassing controls, compromising data quality or reducing compliance. Many fall somewhere between these two extremes, delivering operational efficiency while quietly increasing organisational exposure.

The purpose of Organisational Change Management is not to eliminate workarounds simply because they are unofficial. Instead, practitioners should ask why they

developed in the first place. Is the formal process unrealistic? Does the technology create unnecessary effort? Are governance requirements excessive for routine work? Or have people become accustomed to taking shortcuts?

Every workaround represents valuable feedback about organisational design. By understanding these behaviours before implementation, organisations can redesign future processes that reduce the need for workarounds while preserving the operational agility that keeps the business functioning. In doing so, the future state becomes grounded not only in documented process maps but in the realities of how people actually deliver work every day.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Process maps describe intended work; observation reveals actual work.	Operational workarounds should be assessed before they are removed or automated.
Shadow systems often emerge because they solve unmet business needs.	Local practices may contain important operational controls that formal documentation overlooks.
Excel spreadsheets and whiteboards frequently represent trusted operational knowledge.	Every unofficial process should be evaluated for operational risk before replacement.
Local knowledge is an organisational asset that should be captured, not dismissed.	Removing manual controls requires confidence that equivalent controls are in place in the new solution.
Experienced employees often compensate for weaknesses in processes and systems.	Changes to established workflows should preserve operational continuity during transition.
Understanding why people use workarounds is more valuable than simply eliminating them.	Operational resilience depends upon understanding both formal and informal ways of working.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Discover
Also Supports	Define
Why it matters	Informal practices often reveal the true operating model that formal documentation overlooks.

I've learnt not to place too much confidence in organisational charts or documented processes. They explain structure, but they rarely explain influence. Every organisation has trusted individuals who quietly shape decisions, solve problems and help others navigate complexity. These informal networks often become just as important as formal governance during major transformation. From a Management of Change perspective, understanding how decisions are really made is essential because sustainable organisational capability depends as much on operational

relationships as it does on documented processes. That is the importance of a stakeholder matrix that includes an influence score for engagement; it leads to better targets, and the same goes for the readiness lead: are they going to engage with the manager or the influencer? (Peter)

Chapter 9 – Stakeholders

Stakeholders are often spoken about as though they are simply names on a register or recipients of communication. In reality, stakeholders are the people who determine whether an EAM implementation becomes embedded into everyday operations or quietly fails after go-live. Software can be configured perfectly, but if the people responsible for planning work, maintaining assets, approving budgets, analysing performance or leading teams do not adopt new ways of working, the implementation will struggle to deliver its intended value.

One of the biggest mistakes organisations make is assuming stakeholders are only those directly using the system. An EAM implementation touches maintenance teams, operations, engineering, finance, procurement, stores, contractors, planners, schedulers, executives, regulators and often customers. Every one of these groups experiences the change differently.

From an OCM perspective, stakeholders should not simply be managed; they should be understood. Every stakeholder asks the same questions, even if they never say them aloud.

- Why are we changing?
- What problem are we solving?
- What changes for me?
- Will this make my work easier or harder?
- What happens if I don't support it?
- Who made this decision?
- Can I trust the people leading this change?

Understanding these questions allows change practitioners to move beyond communications and into genuine engagement.

Stakeholders also change over time. Someone supportive during business case development may become resistant when new processes affect their department. Likewise, an early critic may become one of the strongest advocates once they begin to experience the benefits.

Successful OCM practitioners continually reassess stakeholders throughout the implementation rather than treating stakeholder analysis as a one-off activity completed at project initiation.

Internal Stakeholders

Internal stakeholders are the people responsible for realising value from assets. They are not simply users of an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) system—they are the people who collectively deliver on the principles of asset management through their decisions and behaviours every day. This aligns closely with the ISO 55000 definition

of asset management as "the coordinated activity of an organisation to realise value from assets." The emphasis is on coordinated activity. No single department manages assets in isolation.

One of the greatest misconceptions during an EAM implementation is that asset management belongs to the maintenance department. In reality, value is created across the entire asset and service lifecycle by many different functions working together. Every decision made during planning, design, procurement, construction, operations, maintenance, renewal and disposal influences the performance, cost, risk and value delivered by an asset.

From an Organisational Change Management (OCM) perspective, internal stakeholders should be understood in terms of the role they play in delivering value, not simply where they sit on an organisational chart. Their motivations, measures of success and priorities are often different, yet they all contribute to the same organisational outcome.

Internal stakeholders commonly include:

- Executive leadership
- Asset managers
- Operations teams
- Maintenance teams
- Reliability engineers
- Planners and schedulers
- Projects and capital delivery
- Engineering and technical authorities
- Supply chain and procurement
- Warehousing and inventory management
- Finance
- Information Technology
- Health, Safety and Environment
- Customer service functions
- Data and information management teams
- Business analysts and process owners

Each of these groups sees the organisation through a different lens. Finance may focus on return on investment, maintenance on equipment reliability, operations on service continuity, engineering on technical integrity and executives on strategic outcomes. None of these perspectives is wrong; they represent different contributions to the coordinated management of assets.

Effective OCM helps these groups understand how their individual responsibilities connect to the broader asset lifecycle. It builds a shared language, shared objectives and shared ownership so that people stop optimising individual functions and instead optimise organisational performance. One of the strongest indicators of organisational maturity is when departments stop referring to "their assets" or "their data" and begin talking about "our assets" and "our organisational capability."

External Stakeholders

While internal stakeholders realise value from assets, external stakeholders help define why those assets exist in the first place. They shape the organisation's purpose, influence its priorities, and ultimately determine whether it is delivering value to the communities, customers, or markets it serves.

Every organisation exists to create value beyond its own boundaries. For a utility, this may be safe and reliable services. For a transport operator, it may be moving people efficiently. For a mining company, it may be supplying critical resources. For a manufacturer, it is producing quality products. Assets are simply the means by which these outcomes are achieved.

External stakeholders generally fall into two broad groups.

The first are those who expect value from the organisation. These include customers, communities, shareholders, regulators, governments and industry bodies. Each has different expectations regarding safety, reliability, compliance, sustainability, affordability or service quality. These expectations often become the strategic drivers behind investments in Enterprise Asset Management and organisational change.

The second group comprises those who deliver value by supplying products, services, or expertise to the organisation. These include equipment manufacturers, contractors, service providers, technology vendors, consultants, engineering partners and suppliers. Increasingly, they also contribute critical asset information, maintenance knowledge and digital capabilities that become part of the organisation's broader asset information ecosystem.

From an OCM perspective, external stakeholders should never be treated as an afterthought. Suppliers often need to adopt new processes, comply with new asset information standards or work within new digital platforms. Customers may experience changes in service delivery, communication channels or operational practices. Regulators may require evidence that new ways of working continue to meet legislative obligations.

Successful change practitioners recognise that organisational change extends beyond organisational boundaries. The implementation of an EAM system frequently changes how the organisation collaborates with contractors, exchanges information with suppliers, responds to customer needs and demonstrates accountability to regulators.

Ultimately, internal stakeholders determine how value is realised from assets, while external stakeholders define why that value matters. Organisational Change Management sits between the two, helping align the people inside the organisation with the expectations of those outside it. When that alignment is achieved, an EAM implementation becomes far more than a technology project; it becomes an enabler of the organisation's purpose.

Stakeholder mapping

Most projects produce colourful stakeholder maps that are never revisited. Effective stakeholder mapping is far more than placing people into high-power or low-interest

boxes. It is about understanding relationships, influence, motivations and the informal dynamics that shape organisational behaviour.

In an EAM implementation, organisational charts rarely reflect how work actually gets done. The maintenance supervisor who has worked on-site for thirty years may carry far more influence than a senior manager at corporate headquarters. Likewise, an experienced planner, reliability engineer or storeperson may shape the attitudes of dozens of colleagues without holding any formal leadership position.

Good stakeholder mapping therefore considers several dimensions.

- Formal authority
- Informal influence
- Operational knowledge
- Credibility with peers
- Appetite for change
- Exposure to the new solution
- Likelihood of becoming an advocate or opponent

OCM practitioners also map how stakeholders interact with one another. Change rarely spreads through official communication channels. It spreads through conversations over coffee, toolbox meetings, workshops, emails and informal discussions.

The objective is not simply to identify stakeholders. It is to understand where support already exists, where resistance is likely to emerge and where additional engagement is required before issues become visible to the project.

A stakeholder map should evolve throughout the project as new information becomes available.

Influence

Influence is often far more important than authority. Some of the most influential people in an organisation have no direct reports, no executive title and very little formal power. Yet people listen to them because they are trusted, respected and experienced.

Every maintenance organisation has individuals whose opinion carries weight. When they support a new EAM process, others usually follow. When they dismiss it, resistance spreads remarkably quickly.

OCM practitioners spend time identifying these influencers early because influence can accelerate adoption far more effectively than formal communication campaigns.

Influence comes from many sources.

- Technical expertise
- Operational experience
- Personal credibility
- Long organisational history
- Strong relationships

- Consistent performance
- Reputation for solving problems

Influence also works both positively and negatively. A respected technician saying "this new process actually works" can have greater impact than months of executive presentations. Conversely, the expression of frustration by a single influential individual can undermine confidence across an entire business unit.

One of the most valuable activities in change management is understanding who people actually listen to.

Projects succeed when influence is deliberately harnessed rather than accidentally ignored.

Power

Power and influence are related, but they are not the same thing.

Power is the ability to make decisions, allocate resources, approve budgets and enforce priorities. Influence is the ability to shape opinions and behaviours.

An executive sponsor may have significant organisational power but limited day-to-day influence over frontline maintenance teams. Equally, a leading tradesperson may have almost no formal authority yet possess enormous influence over how new work practices are accepted.

From an OCM perspective, understanding where power resides helps explain why some decisions are made and why others continually stall.

Power exists at many levels.

- Executive sponsorship
- Budget ownership
- Operational control
- Governance authority
- Union representation
- Technical decision-making
- Information ownership

Successful change practitioners understand that power shifts throughout an implementation.

During business case development, finance and executives often hold significant power.

During the design phase, business process owners become critical.

During testing, subject matter experts become increasingly influential.

During deployment, frontline leaders often determine whether new behaviours become everyday practice.

Understanding these shifting centres of power enables change activities to remain aligned with organisational reality.

Politics

Many people avoid talking about organisational politics, yet politics exists in every organisation. Ignoring it does not make it disappear.

Politics reflects competing priorities, interests, and perspectives.

An EAM implementation may alter reporting lines, redistribute responsibilities, expose poor data quality, remove local workarounds or increase transparency around maintenance performance. These changes inevitably affect individuals differently.

Some groups perceive opportunity.

Others perceive risk.

Some see increased control.

Others fear loss of autonomy.

OCM practitioners do not attempt to eliminate politics. Instead, they seek to understand it.

Political dynamics often emerge around issues such as:

- Budget ownership
- Process ownership
- Asset ownership
- Performance measurement
- Resource allocation
- Organisational restructures
- Historical relationships between departments

The most successful change leaders acknowledge political realities openly while keeping discussions focused on organisational outcomes rather than individual agendas.

Ignoring politics rarely prevents conflict. Understanding politics allows change practitioners to anticipate concerns before they become project risks.

Asset Lifecycle

One of the most common mistakes made during an EAM implementation is focusing organisational change around the project lifecycle rather than the asset lifecycle. Projects have a beginning and an end. Assets do not. They are planned, designed, constructed, commissioned, operated, maintained, renewed and eventually retired, often over decades. Organisational Change Management should therefore be centred on how people interact with assets throughout their lifecycle, rather than simply on how they use a new software application.

An EAM system is fundamentally a lifecycle management platform. Every role within the organisation contributes information, makes decisions or performs activities at

different stages of an asset's life. Engineers define asset requirements and specifications. Projects construct and commission assets. Operations use them to deliver services. Maintenance preserves reliability and performance. Supply chain supports the availability of parts and materials. Finance manages depreciation and investment decisions. Asset managers use lifecycle information to determine renewal and replacement strategies.

From an OCM perspective, one of the greatest challenges is helping people understand that the quality of decisions made later in an asset's life depends on the quality of information captured much earlier. If asset data is incomplete during construction, maintenance teams inherit poor information. If work orders are not completed accurately during operations, reliability engineers have little evidence to identify recurring failures. If condition data is inconsistent, investment decisions become increasingly difficult to justify.

Organisational change therefore extends beyond teaching people how to enter data into an EAM system. It requires building an understanding that every interaction contributes to the asset's long-term value and to the quality of organisational decision-making.

An effective change program encourages people to see where they fit within the broader asset lifecycle rather than viewing their work as isolated tasks. This helps break down traditional organisational silos and reinforces the shared responsibility for asset management across multiple functions.

From an OCM perspective, it is valuable to engage stakeholders at each stage of the asset lifecycle, including:

- Planning and investment
- Design and engineering
- Construction and commissioning
- Operations
- Maintenance and reliability
- Supply chain and inventory management
- Asset performance and optimisation
- Renewal and capital planning
- Decommissioning and disposal

Each stage introduces different stakeholders, priorities, and behaviours that the organisation must support. The communication, training and engagement required for a project engineer are very different from those needed by a maintenance planner or an operations supervisor.

Ultimately, successful EAM implementations occur when people stop thinking about "using the system" and start thinking about managing assets throughout their lifecycle. The software enables that capability. The real organisational change is creating a culture where every person understands how their decisions today influence the performance, cost, risk and value of assets for many years to come.

Resistance

Resistance is often misunderstood as people refusing to embrace change. More often than not, resistance is simply people protecting something they value.

- That may be competence.
- Job security.
- Professional identity.
- Safety.
- Relationships.
- Local autonomy.
- Established routines.

Many project teams respond to resistance by increasing communication. Unfortunately, more communication rarely changes minds if the underlying concern remains unresolved.

OCM practitioners view resistance as valuable information.

It tells us where people feel uncertain, threatened or unconvinced.

Some resistance is visible.

People openly challenge decisions, question the project, or refuse to participate.

- Other resistance is hidden.
- Meetings become quieter.
- Decisions slow down.
- Training attendance declines.
- Workarounds increase.
- Data quality deteriorates.

The objective is not to eliminate resistance but to understand its source.

When people feel heard, involved and respected, resistance frequently becomes constructive feedback that strengthens both the solution and the implementation approach.

Networks

Every organisation has two structures.

- The formal organisation.
- The real organisation.
- The formal organisation appears on organisational charts.
- The real organisation exists through relationships.

These informal networks determine how information spreads, how problems are solved and how opinions are formed.

Experienced OCM practitioners spend time understanding these networks because they often explain why some changes gain momentum while others struggle.

Networks exist through:

- Long-standing working relationships
- Shared operational experience
- Professional communities
- Site-based teams
- Technical disciplines
- Informal mentoring
- Cross-functional collaboration

Information flowing through trusted networks is often considered more credible than official project communications.

Understanding networks allows organisations to identify where engagement should occur, who should participate in workshops and which individuals are best positioned to reinforce desired behaviours.

Strong networks become powerful accelerators of organisational change.

Champions

Change champions are frequently misunderstood as volunteers who attend occasional meetings and distribute project updates.

Effective champions are much more than that.

They become the bridge between the project and the operational business.

Because champions understand both the local environment and the implementation objectives, they help translate project language into operational reality.

Good champions:

- Provide honest feedback.
- Test ideas before wider deployment.
- Identify emerging resistance.
- Explain local concerns.
- Demonstrate desired behaviours.
- Support colleagues during transition.
- Reinforce change after go-live.

Champions should never become project cheerleaders.

Their credibility depends on remaining authentic and trusted by their peers.

The strongest champions are often those who initially asked difficult questions because they understand the concerns others are likely to raise.

OCM succeeds when champions become genuine advocates, grounded in experience rather than obligation.

Leadership alignment

Leadership alignment is one of the strongest predictors of implementation success.

Employees rarely judge change by reading project documentation.

They judge it by watching their leaders.

When leaders send mixed messages, demonstrate inconsistent behaviours, or publicly disagree about priorities, uncertainty spreads rapidly throughout the organisation.

Alignment means far more than executive approval.

It means leaders consistently communicate the same purpose, reinforce the same expectations, and demonstrate the behaviours they expect others to adopt.

For an EAM implementation, leadership alignment should exist across:

- Executive leadership
- Operational leadership
- Maintenance management
- Engineering leadership
- IT leadership
- Finance leadership
- Frontline supervisors

Perhaps most importantly, leaders must model the change themselves.

If executives ask for data-driven decisions but continue to accept spreadsheets rather than EAM reports, people quickly learn that old behaviours remain acceptable.

If supervisors bypass new work management processes because they believe the new processes are faster, teams will follow their lead.

People pay far more attention to what leaders do than to what they say.

Successful organisational change occurs when leadership speaks with one voice, behaves consistently and remains visibly committed long after the excitement of project launch has passed.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Stakeholders should be understood by their influence, interests and contribution to value creation.	Decision makers should be clearly identified for every operational change.
Internal stakeholders experience change differently depending on their role in the asset lifecycle.	Accountability for approving operational changes should never be ambiguous.
External stakeholders shape organisational expectations through regulation, supply and customer demand.	Suppliers and contractors should comply with the same governance standards as internal teams.
Resistance often reflects genuine operational concerns rather than opposition to change.	Changes affecting external interfaces should be reviewed for operational and contractual implications.

Trusted informal leaders frequently influence adoption more than formal management structures.	Escalation pathways should be established before significant operational decisions are required.
Successful engagement builds partnerships rather than simply managing stakeholders.	Effective governance ensures all affected stakeholders are consulted before implementation decisions are made.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Discover
Also Supports	Define, Design, Deliver, Depart
Why it matters	Stakeholder engagement is continuous throughout the entire organisational change journey.

Some of the most valuable lessons I've learnt have come from simply spending time with the people who actually perform the work. Process maps tell one story, but conversations, observations and relationships tell another. Every organisation has informal networks, workarounds and local knowledge that rarely appear in project documentation.

I've learnt that people don't create workarounds because they dislike systems. They usually create them to keep the business operating. Understanding those realities has helped me become a better practitioner and reminds me never to assume I understand an organisation until I've spent time listening. (Martin)

Operational knowledge is one of an organisation's most valuable assets. Informal practices often exist because they protect safety, reliability, continuity or risk controls.

Before changing an operational process, Management of Change must first understand what that process protects. Good MoC begins with understanding today's controls before designing tomorrow's.

Stakeholders should also be understood in terms of the accountability they carry, not simply by function or communication needs. Some hold decision authority, some manage risk, some maintain critical information, and others carry historical knowledge that the programme depends upon.

Where stakeholder access is limited, these responsibilities, dependencies and escalation paths should be captured once and maintained centrally. This reduces the need for repeated demands on operational teams and improves decision quality across the programme.

Stakeholder planning becomes more valuable when it is built around organisational accountability and consequences, not just communication. (Peter)

Part Four - Designing the Future

Chapter 10 - Defining "To Be"

Many projects invest enormous effort in understanding the current ("As Is") environment, yet surprisingly little time is spent defining what success actually looks like. The result is often a solution that reflects today's problems rather than tomorrow's opportunities. From an Organisational Change Management (OCM) perspective, defining the "To Be" is far more than documenting future processes or configuring software. It is creating a shared picture of how the organisation intends to operate once the change has been embedded.

The future state should answer several fundamental questions. How will work be performed? Who will make decisions? What behaviours will be expected? What information will be trusted? How will people collaborate across departments? What capabilities will the organisation possess that it does not have today?

One of the greatest mistakes organisations make is allowing the software implementation team to define the future state in isolation. The software can demonstrate what is possible, but only the business can determine what is desirable. The "To Be" should therefore emerge through collaboration between operational leaders, frontline employees, asset managers, IT, finance, engineering and executive sponsors.

OCM practitioners facilitate these conversations by helping stakeholders move beyond existing frustrations and imagine improved ways of working. This often requires challenging long-held assumptions, historical workarounds and local optimisation that have become accepted as normal. People naturally design around what they know today. Effective change management helps them think differently.

Importantly, the future state should not be viewed as a fixed destination. Organisations evolve, regulations change, technology advances and business priorities shift. The "To Be" should therefore provide enough clarity to guide implementation while remaining flexible enough to accommodate future improvement.

The role of OCM is to ensure that people understand not only what the future state will look like, but why it has been designed that way, how it benefits the organisation and what it means for their own role. When people can see themselves in the future, they are far more likely to help create it.

Business operating model

Implementing an Enterprise Asset Management system is rarely about replacing software. It is about changing the way an organisation operates. This is why the business operating model deserves as much attention as the technology itself.

A business operating model describes how strategy is translated into everyday operations. It brings together organisational structures, governance, business processes, people, information, technology, performance measures, and culture into a coherent framework for delivering value.

From an OCM perspective, introducing a new operating model represents one of the most significant organisational changes a business can undertake. Employees are not simply learning new software; they are often being asked to take on new responsibilities, collaborate differently, make decisions with different information, and measure success in new ways.

Many implementation teams mistakenly believe that publishing an operating model will automatically change behaviour. Experience suggests otherwise. People continue to work according to incentives, relationships, habits and local priorities unless those factors are deliberately addressed.

The change journey therefore involves progressively helping people transition from today's operating model to tomorrow's. Leaders must reinforce new expectations, managers must coach different behaviours, governance forums must support new decision-making practices and performance measures must reward the outcomes the organisation wants to achieve.

Successful operating model transformation is iterative. Early pilots, lessons learned, continuous feedback and incremental improvements are often more effective than attempting a single "big bang" transition. OCM provides mechanisms for listening, adapting, and reinforcing changes as the organisation gains experience.

Ultimately, the operating model should become the way the organisation naturally works—not something described in a PowerPoint presentation. When that occurs, the software becomes an enabler rather than the centrepiece of the transformation.

Future governance

Governance is often thought of as committees, approval gates and reporting structures. While these are important, future governance is fundamentally about how decisions will be made, who will make them and how accountability will be maintained once the implementation team has left.

Many EAM projects establish temporary project governance that functions well during implementation but disappears after go-live. The organisation then finds itself without clear ownership of system improvements, master data, business rules or process compliance. The result is gradual degradation of both the system and the business practices it supports.

OCM helps organisations design governance that survives beyond the project. This means identifying long-term business owners, establishing forums for continuous improvement and ensuring that responsibilities are understood at every level of the organisation.

Future governance also requires behavioural change. Leaders must become comfortable making decisions based on trusted enterprise data rather than relying solely on personal experience. Functional managers need to collaborate across departmental boundaries rather than optimising only their own areas. Employees need confidence that decisions are being made consistently and transparently.

An effective governance model should strike the right balance between control and empowerment. Too much governance creates bureaucracy and slows decision-making. Too little creates inconsistency, duplicated effort and local variations that undermine enterprise capability.

The role of OCM is to prepare leaders for these new governance responsibilities, develop the capability to operate within the new framework and reinforce the behaviours that support accountability. Governance only becomes real when people consistently apply it in everyday work.

Future processes

Future processes are often documented using process maps, procedures and work instructions. While these documents are essential, they do not guarantee that people will actually perform the work as intended.

OCM recognises that changing a process is fundamentally about changing behaviour. Every process change requires someone to stop doing something familiar and begin doing something differently. That transition rarely occurs simply because a new procedure has been published.

Future process design should therefore involve the people who will ultimately perform the work. Their operational knowledge often reveals practical challenges that process designers may miss. Involving them early also creates ownership and reduces resistance later in the project.

It is equally important to distinguish between standardisation and flexibility. EAM implementations often seek to standardise maintenance planning, work management, asset hierarchy, inventory management and procurement processes across multiple sites. While consistency delivers significant business benefits, organisations should avoid removing flexibility where genuine operational differences exist.

OCM practitioners help organisations prepare for these changes by assessing impacts, developing role-specific learning, coaching leaders and creating opportunities for employees to practise new ways of working before go-live.

The objective is not simply to implement a new process but to establish a new organisational habit. When future processes become the normal way of working rather than "the project process", sustainable business improvement begins to emerge.

Future roles

Technology rarely eliminates work; it changes the nature of the work people perform. As organisations implement modern EAM platforms, many roles evolve from administrative processing towards decision support, planning, analysis and continuous improvement.

One of OCM's earliest responsibilities is helping employees understand how their roles will change. Uncertainty creates anxiety, and anxiety fuels resistance. People naturally ask, "What will my job look like?", "Will I still be needed?", and "Will I be successful in the new environment?"

These concerns should not be dismissed. Instead, organisations should communicate openly about changing responsibilities, new expectations and emerging opportunities. Honest conversations build trust far more effectively than avoiding difficult topics.

Role design should focus not only on activities but also on decision rights, collaboration, accountability and required competencies. Maintenance planners, reliability engineers, warehouse personnel, supervisors, operators, and executives may interact with the EAM system differently than they do today.

Managers also experience significant role changes. Rather than supervising transactions, they increasingly coach performance, interpret analytics, remove barriers and support continuous improvement. These leadership changes often require just as much development as the technical training provided to frontline staff.

OCM ensures that future roles are clearly defined, communicated and supported through training, coaching and ongoing reinforcement. Successful transformation occurs when people understand not only what they need to do differently, but why their new role contributes to better organisational outcomes.

Future capability

Implementing software does not automatically create organisational capability. Capability is developed when people possess the knowledge, skills, confidence, behaviours and supporting environment required to consistently achieve desired outcomes.

Many organisations focus heavily on system training immediately before go-live. While necessary, training alone rarely creates capability. Employees also require practice, coaching, leadership support, access to knowledge, clear expectations and opportunities to learn from experience.

OCM adopts a broader view of capability development. It begins by identifying the capabilities required in the future operating model and assessing existing organisational strengths and gaps. These capabilities extend well beyond software use to include planning, scheduling, reliability thinking, data stewardship, asset management, collaboration, decision-making, and continuous improvement.

Capability development should begin early and continue well beyond implementation. The most successful organisations embed learning into everyday work through mentoring, communities of practice, refresher learning, leadership coaching and post-implementation improvement initiatives.

An important aspect of future capability is organisational resilience. As experienced employees retire and new staff join the workforce, knowledge must be transferred into repeatable systems, processes and learning programs rather than remaining with individuals.

Ultimately, capability becomes the bridge between technology investment and business performance. OCM ensures that this bridge is deliberately constructed rather than assumed to exist.

Decision making

One of the most significant changes introduced by an EAM implementation is not the software itself but the way decisions are made. Organisations move from relying on personal judgement, fragmented information and local experience towards decisions supported by trusted enterprise data.

This shift represents a profound cultural change. Experienced employees have often built successful careers using intuition and local knowledge. Asking them to trust dashboards, analytics and standardised information can be perceived as questioning their expertise rather than enhancing it.

OCM helps position data-driven decision-making as an evolution rather than a replacement for professional judgement. The goal is to combine experience with reliable information to produce better outcomes than either could achieve alone.

Future decision-making also depends on governance. People need clarity about who has authority to make particular decisions, what information should inform those decisions and how success will be measured. Without this clarity, organisations quickly revert to historical behaviours regardless of what the software allows.

Leaders play a critical role in modelling the future state. If executives continue to make decisions based on anecdotal information or to request spreadsheets outside the EAM system, employees will quickly conclude that the new processes are optional. Conversely, when leaders consistently ask for evidence from trusted systems and recognise the value of data-driven decision-making, new behaviours become embedded.

The role of OCM is therefore not simply to communicate new decision-making frameworks but to help leaders and employees develop confidence in using them. Sustainable transformation occurs when data-informed decisions become part of the organisational culture rather than a project objective.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Future-state design should begin with business capability rather than software functionality.	Future operating models should preserve critical operational controls while improving efficiency.
Employees are more likely to embrace a future they helped design.	Proposed governance changes should be reviewed for operational, regulatory and safety implications.
Defining future roles creates clarity long before implementation begins.	Decision-making authority should be formally documented before new processes are introduced.
Designing future processes provides an opportunity to simplify work rather than automate complexity.	New operational procedures should be validated before replacing existing approved practices.
Organisational design should encourage collaboration across asset lifecycles rather than reinforce silos.	Every future-state process should include clearly defined ownership and accountability.

Successful future-state design balances strategic ambition with practical operational realities.	The future operating model should strengthen operational resilience rather than introduce unnecessary risk.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Design
Also Supports	Define
Why it matters	Designing future ways of working translates strategy into practical business capability.

Designing a future state is exciting because everyone starts imagining what's possible. The challenge is to ensure we design more than just future processes. Throughout my career, I've found that the best future-state workshops eventually shift towards ownership, governance, decision rights and accountability. Those conversations are sometimes harder than designing the process itself, but they're also the conversations that determine whether the organisation can actually sustain the future state long after the project has finished. One other facet to be considered carefully is the adaptability of the organisation: change; we continue to change with the governance structures we implement; what our review cycles are, what standards must we monitor, is there an overall framework we must consider and the ability (Peter)

Chapter 11 – Designing the Future Information Environment

Designing the future information environment is about far more than selecting software or defining system integrations. It is about deliberately designing how information will support the organisation's future operating model, enabling people to make better decisions, collaborate more effectively and manage assets with confidence. While technology provides the platform, information provides the intelligence that allows an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) system to deliver value. Organisational Change Management (OCM) therefore has a critical role to play in ensuring the business is not only ready for new technology but is also prepared to think differently about information as a strategic organisational asset.

One of the recurring lessons from our own experience is that organisations often focus on migrating data while overlooking the behaviours, ownership and governance required to sustain information quality long after go-live. A new EAM system cannot compensate for poor information practices, unclear accountability or a lack of trust in the data. Lasting success comes when people understand where information comes from, why it matters, how others use it, and what their own responsibility is in maintaining its integrity. Information quality is not an IT responsibility; it is a business capability.

The topics in this chapter explore the components of a future information environment that supports sustainable asset management. They consider how information should be structured, governed, and maintained; how master data and standards create consistency across the organisation; and how reporting and analytics become tools

for better decision-making rather than simply producing more reports. They also examine the growing importance of digital ways of working and the need to build trust in enterprise information so that people naturally rely on the EA system rather than reverting to spreadsheets, notebooks, and local databases.

Ultimately, an EAM implementation is successful when information is valued as highly as the physical assets it describes. When people trust the information, understand their role in maintaining it, and use it confidently to make operational decisions, the organisation moves beyond simply implementing software and begins to build a truly information-enabled asset management capability. That is the future state Organisational Change Management is helping to create.

Why Information Design Matters

Enterprise Asset Management implementations are often described as software projects, but in reality they are information projects supported by technology. Every maintenance decision, inspection, procurement activity, work order, shutdown plan, and capital investment depends on the quality of the information available to the people making the decisions.

One of the greatest misconceptions in EAM implementations is that data migration is simply about moving information from one system to another. In practice, organisations are redesigning how information is created, maintained, shared, trusted and governed across the entire asset lifecycle.

Organisational Change Management (OCM) plays a critical role in this transformation because information quality is ultimately a people issue. Systems do not create accurate data; people do. Systems do not maintain data quality; people do. Systems cannot establish trust in information; people do through consistent behaviours, governance and accountability.

Designing the future information environment therefore involves changing behaviours just as much as designing databases. The objective is not merely to implement better technology, but to build an organisation that consistently values information as a strategic asset.

Information Architecture

An Enterprise Asset Management platform becomes the central repository of asset information, but it rarely operates in isolation. Information flows between ERP systems, GIS, SCADA, document management platforms, engineering systems, procurement applications, mobile solutions, reliability systems and numerous specialist applications.

Information architecture defines how these systems interact, where information is mastered, how it moves between platforms and which system is considered the source of truth for each type of information.

From an OCM perspective, information architecture is not simply an IT design exercise. Every integration changes how people access information, where they perform work and which systems they trust. If users are unsure where to find

information or encounter conflicting data across systems, their confidence quickly erodes.

Successful organisations therefore spend time educating stakeholders about the future information landscape. Rather than teaching people only how to use an individual application, they explain how the entire information ecosystem supports business operations.

When people understand why information exists where it does, duplication reduces, collaboration improves, and confidence in enterprise systems grows significantly.

Master Data

Master data provides the common language that allows an organisation to operate consistently. Asset hierarchies, equipment registers, locations, functional classifications, work types, failure codes, suppliers, inventory items and organisational structures all form part of this foundation.

Many organisations discover during implementation that they have multiple versions of the same asset, inconsistent naming conventions and conflicting business rules that have accumulated over many years.

Cleaning the data is only part of the challenge. OCM focuses on preventing the organisation from recreating these problems after go-live. This requires establishing ownership, governance and accountability for maintaining master data over time.

Employees need to understand why standardisation matters. Entering information consistently may appear to create additional work for an individual, but it generates significant value for planners, reliability engineers, finance teams and executives who depend on accurate enterprise information.

The future state is achieved when maintaining quality master data becomes an accepted responsibility rather than a system-imposed administrative burden.

Information Ownership

One of the most common causes of declining data quality is the assumption that "someone else owns the data."

In high-performing organisations, every critical information object has a clearly defined business owner. These owners are responsible for ensuring information remains accurate, complete, compliant and fit for purpose throughout its lifecycle.

OCM assists organisations by clarifying these responsibilities before implementation. Rather than assigning ownership solely on organisational hierarchy, responsibility should align with the people best positioned to maintain information quality as part of their normal work.

Ownership also requires leadership support. Managers must reinforce expectations, allocate sufficient time for maintaining information quality and recognise the value that good information creates for the wider organisation.

When ownership becomes embedded within business operations rather than remaining a project responsibility, information quality becomes sustainable.

Data Standards

Every organisation has standards, whether documented or not. The question is whether they are consistent.

Data standards define how information should be structured, named, classified and maintained across the enterprise. They allow reporting to be meaningful, integrations to function correctly and analytics to produce reliable insights.

Introducing standards often generates resistance because local teams have developed naming conventions and practices that suit their immediate needs. While these approaches may work locally, they frequently create enterprise-wide inconsistency.

OCM practitioners facilitate discussions that balance standardisation with operational practicality. Rather than presenting standards as rules imposed by head office, they help employees understand how consistency improves safety, planning, procurement, regulatory reporting and organisational performance.

The objective is not perfect compliance but widespread adoption driven by shared understanding rather than enforcement alone.

Future Reporting and Analytics

Modern EAM systems provide unprecedented access to operational information. Dashboards, predictive analytics, reliability measures, maintenance performance indicators, and asset health information enable organisations to make faster, more informed decisions.

However, providing dashboards does not automatically create analytical capability.

Many organisations continue producing spreadsheets because managers trust familiar reports more than new dashboards. Others generate hundreds of reports that nobody uses because reporting requirements were never aligned to business decisions.

OCM focuses on changing reporting behaviours rather than simply delivering reporting tools. Leaders need to understand which measures matter, how to interpret trends and how to use information to drive conversations and decisions.

The future state is not measured by the number of dashboards implemented, but by the quality of decisions made as a result of them.

Digital Ways of Working

Technology enables transformation, but only people can realise its value.

Future ways of working increasingly involve mobile devices, digital workflows, electronic approvals, online collaboration, automated notifications and integrated business processes. For many employees, particularly those who have relied on paper-based processes for decades, these represent significant behavioural changes.

OCM recognises that digital adoption is influenced by confidence, experience, leadership support and organisational culture. Successful organisations invest as much in helping people become comfortable working digitally as they do in implementing the technology itself.

This often involves identifying digital champions, providing ongoing coaching, simplifying user experiences and celebrating early successes that demonstrate practical value.

The goal is not to create digitally skilled employees for the sake of technology. It is to create a workforce that uses digital tools naturally to improve safety, reliability, productivity, and decision-making.

Building Trust in Information

Perhaps the greatest challenge in any EAM implementation is building trust.

If employees believe the information is inaccurate, incomplete, or outdated, they will quickly revert to spreadsheets, notebooks, whiteboards, and verbal communication, regardless of how sophisticated the software is.

Trust is earned gradually through consistent experience. It develops when planners find accurate bills of materials, technicians locate the correct asset records, supervisors receive reliable performance information, and executives see reports that reflect operational reality.

OCM contributes by ensuring that communication, leadership behaviours, governance, training and reinforcement all promote confidence in enterprise information. Early wins should be deliberately selected to demonstrate the value of trusted data and encourage wider adoption.

Ultimately, successful EAM implementations are built on trust; not trust in software, but trust in the information, the processes and the people who use them. When that trust exists, technology becomes an accelerator of organisational performance rather than simply another application in the IT landscape.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Information should support better decisions at every organisational level.	Information structures should maintain configuration integrity throughout the asset lifecycle.
People trust systems when information is accurate, relevant and readily available.	Data ownership should be formally assigned before migration or operational use.
Metadata and standards improve confidence by creating a shared understanding of information.	Information governance should define how changes to critical asset data are authorised.
A single source of truth reduces confusion and supports consistent decision-making.	Reference data should remain controlled to prevent unintended operational consequences.

Information maturity is achieved through governance as much as technology.	Changes to master data require traceability, approval and ongoing quality assurance.
Better information changes behaviours by enabling informed decisions rather than assumptions.	Reliable information is fundamental to safe, compliant, and effective operational decision-making.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Design
Also Supports	Define
Why it matters	Future information requirements ensure that technology enables informed operational decision-making.

One lesson I've learnt is that information deteriorates long before the technology does. Organisations often believe that replacing the system will solve their information problems, yet the same poor ownership, inconsistent standards, and local workarounds migrate to the new platform. Throughout my career, I've found that trusted information isn't created by software; it is created by people who understand that every record they create will eventually influence someone else's decision. When information becomes everyone's responsibility rather than IT's responsibility, the quality of decision-making changes dramatically. This aligns well with OCM's cultural shift towards Information as an Asset; with that new mindset in place, governance frameworks can be implemented to nurture an organisation's information, not just capture data for lag indicators. (Peter)

Chapter 12 - Ways of Working

Asset Management is commonly defined as the coordinated activity of an organisation to realise value from assets. While this definition appears simple, it carries a profound implication for Organisational Change Management. The emphasis is not on the assets themselves or the technology used to manage them; it is on the organisation's coordinated activity. Realising value from assets depends upon hundreds or thousands of people making consistent decisions, performing complementary roles, sharing reliable information and working towards common outcomes. An Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) system can enable this coordination, but it cannot create it. Coordination is ultimately a product of people, leadership, governance and culture.

This chapter explores the organisational mechanisms that enable coordination. Clearly defined business roles, appropriate system roles, understood responsibilities, accountability, decision rights, authority and workflow ownership all establish who does what and why it matters. Equally important are the behaviours and cross-functional relationships that connect Maintenance, Operations, Engineering, Supply Chain, Finance and many other disciplines across the asset lifecycle. Organisational Change Management exists to help these groups move beyond traditional functional silos and adopt ways of working that optimise the performance of the whole

organisation rather than individual departments. When people understand how their contribution supports the coordinated management of assets, the organisation is far better positioned to realise sustainable value not through better technology, but through better ways of working together.

Business roles

One of the biggest misconceptions in Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementations is that technology changes jobs. In reality, technology rarely changes why people come to work; it changes how they perform their roles, who they interact with, what information they require and what decisions they are expected to make. From an Organisational Change Management perspective, defining business roles is about helping people understand their place in the future operating model rather than simply assigning transactions within a system.

Business roles should always be defined independently of the software. A Maintenance Planner is still a Maintenance Planner whether they use SAP, IBM Maximo, Oracle, Hexagon or a spreadsheet. Their purpose remains to plan work that maximises productivity and asset reliability. The software enables that role more effectively.

OCM focuses on ensuring people understand how their responsibilities evolve as the organisation adopts new ways of working. This often means clarifying role boundaries, eliminating duplicate activities, fostering greater collaboration across departments, and redefining expectations for data ownership and decision-making.

Well-defined business roles also reduce organisational anxiety. During change, people naturally ask, "What does this mean for me?" Clear role definitions answer that question before rumours and assumptions fill the gap. They also provide the foundation for training, performance management, communications and capability development.

Ultimately, successful implementations are achieved not because people know how to use the system, but because they understand how their business role contributes to organisational outcomes within the new operating model.

System roles (SBRs)

System roles are often confused with business roles, yet they serve entirely different purposes. A business role describes what someone is accountable for within the organisation. A system role defines what they are authorised to see, create, modify or approve within the application.

From an OCM perspective, system roles are more than security profiles—they influence how people experience the new solution. If permissions are overly restrictive, people become frustrated and seek workarounds. If they are too broad, governance weakens, and data quality deteriorates. Finding the right balance requires close collaboration between business leaders, security administrators and change practitioners.

Change managers also recognise that assigning system roles represents a psychological transition. Employees often perceive access rights as a reflection of trust, authority and status. Changes to permissions can therefore create unintended resistance if they are not well explained.

Training should always be delivered in the context of system roles. People should learn the system through the lens of the activities they perform every day rather than generic navigation. This makes learning more relevant, improves adoption and reduces cognitive overload.

When business roles and system roles are aligned, people understand both what they are expected to do and how the technology enables them to do it safely, efficiently and consistently.

Responsibilities

Successful change depends on everyone understanding their responsibilities within the future organisation. While systems automate many activities, responsibility can never be automated. Someone must remain accountable for planning work, maintaining data, approving expenditure, managing risk and ensuring assets continue to perform.

OCM seeks to clarify responsibilities early in the programme. Unclear responsibilities are among the leading causes of duplication, execution gaps, and team conflicts. They also contribute to the common belief that "someone else is looking after it."

Responsibilities extend beyond operational activities. Modern EAM implementations increasingly require people to take responsibility for maintaining high-quality asset information, participating in continuous improvement, supporting colleagues, and identifying opportunities to optimise work practices.

Clearly documenting responsibilities also supports communication, training and leadership engagement. People are far more likely to embrace change when they understand not only what they must do, but why those responsibilities matter to the broader organisation.

Ultimately, responsibility provides the bridge between organisational objectives and individual contribution.

Accountability

Responsibility and accountability are often used interchangeably, yet they are fundamentally different. People may be responsible for completing a task, but someone must remain accountable for the outcome.

Organisational Change Management places significant emphasis on accountability because sustainable change requires leaders and employees alike to own the results of new ways of working. Without accountability, organisations quickly drift back towards familiar behaviours, regardless of how well the system has been implemented.

Accountability should be visible throughout the operating model. Leaders should know which outcomes they own. Supervisors should understand which standards they must enforce. Individuals should understand which data they are expected to maintain accurately and which business processes rely upon their actions.

Embedding accountability also means reinforcing it after go-live. Performance conversations, coaching, governance meetings and continuous improvement activities should all reinforce expectations established during the project.

When accountability is clear, people stop asking who should fix problems and begin taking ownership of preventing them.

RASCI

One of the simplest yet most powerful tools for reducing confusion during an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation is a RASCI matrix. It provides a shared understanding of who owns decisions, who performs the work, who provides expertise, who must be consulted, and who needs to be kept informed.

Many EAM implementations struggle because responsibilities are assumed rather than agreed. Business teams expect the project to make decisions; the System Integrator assumes the business owns them; technical teams wait for direction; and governance groups believe they have delegated authority when they have only provided oversight.

Organisational Change Management (OCM) helps define and communicate these responsibilities, while the Management of Change (MoC) ensures they are transitioned into sustainable Business-as-Usual (BAU) ownership.

Although RASCI matrices can become highly detailed, keeping them simple often delivers the greatest value. Every major deliverable, decision and ongoing business process should have a clearly identified owner before implementation begins.

Role	Project Perspective	Business-as-Usual (BAU) Perspective
Responsible	The individual or team who performs the work to deliver the outcome. They complete the task or activity.	The person or team who performs the operational activity as part of normal business operations.
Accountable	The single person who ultimately owns the decision or deliverable and signs off that it is complete. There should only be one Accountable owner.	The operational owner who remains accountable for the process, service, asset information or business outcome after the project has finished.
Support	People or teams who actively assist those responsible by providing resources, specialist skills or additional capacity.	Support functions that enable successful operation, such as IT Support, Asset Information teams, Training or Centres of Excellence.
Consulted	Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) and stakeholders whose knowledge is required before decisions are made. Communication is two-way.	Business experts, governance groups, and technical specialists who continue to provide advice when improvements or changes are proposed.
Informed	Individuals or groups who need to understand progress, decisions or impacts but are not directly involved	Leaders, users, regulators, or stakeholders who require visibility into operational performance, planned changes, or business outcomes.

	in the work. Communication is one-way.	

An effective RASCI evolves as the implementation progresses.

During **Discover** and **Define**, it clarifies who owns requirements, business processes, data, governance and future operating decisions.

During **Design** and **Deliver**, it helps prevent confusion between the business, project team, System Integrator and technology vendors by making ownership explicit.

During **Depart**, the emphasis shifts from project ownership to operational ownership. Responsibilities transfer from project resources to the business, ensuring that accountability for data quality, asset information, business processes, governance, system administration and continuous improvement remains within the organisation rather than leaving with the implementation team.

One of the recurring lessons from successful EAM implementations is that **software can be implemented by a project, but capability can only be owned by the business**. A well-defined RASCI makes this distinction visible. It reinforces that projects deliver solutions, while operational teams own the long-term realisation of value from those solutions.

A RASCI should not be viewed as a project administration tool. It is an organisational alignment tool that helps establish clear ownership, reduce ambiguity, and support the transition from implementation to sustainable Business as Usual.

Decision rights

Many implementation challenges arise because organisations fail to define who has the authority to make which decisions. Technology can automate approvals, but it cannot resolve ambiguity about organisational decision-making.

Decision rights determine who approves work, prioritises maintenance, accepts risk, changes master data, modifies processes and allocates resources. From an OCM perspective, these decisions influence organisational behaviour just as much as the technology itself.

Poorly defined decision rights create delays, frustration and unnecessary escalation. Conversely, clearly delegated authority empowers employees, improves responsiveness and increases confidence in the new operating model.

During change initiatives, decision rights often shift closer to operational teams because better information becomes available through the EAM system. While this can improve agility, it also requires leaders to become comfortable delegating authority and trusting data-driven decisions.

Helping leaders and employees understand these new decision boundaries is an important part of successful organisational adoption.

Behaviours

Technology implementations succeed or fail because of behaviours rather than functionality. Organisations frequently document new processes without considering whether people's daily behaviours will actually change.

From an OCM perspective, behaviours represent the visible expression of culture. They include how people collaborate, whether they trust the system, how consistently they follow processes, whether they capture quality data and how they respond to problems.

Changing behaviour requires more than training. It requires leadership role modelling, reinforcement, coaching, performance expectations and recognition. People must repeatedly experience that the new behaviour is easier, more valuable and more rewarding than the old one.

Many organisations unintentionally reinforce old behaviours by measuring legacy performance indicators or allowing exceptions that undermine new processes. Sustainable change therefore depends upon aligning systems, leadership, governance and performance management around the desired behaviours.

When behaviours change consistently across the organisation, the implementation becomes part of normal business rather than another project.

Workflow ownership

Every workflow requires an owner. Unfortunately, many organisations implement workflows that cross multiple departments without assigning anyone overall accountability for their performance.

Workflow ownership means taking responsibility for how work flows from initiation through to completion, regardless of organisational boundaries. The owner focuses on improving the entire process rather than optimising individual departmental activities.

From an OCM perspective, identifying workflow owners is critical because organisational silos are often a major barrier to successful EAM adoption. Maintenance, Operations, Procurement, Finance and Engineering all contribute to the same workflow, yet each may have different priorities and measures of success.

Workflow owners facilitate collaboration, resolve bottlenecks, monitor performance and champion continuous improvement. They also become valuable advocates during implementation because they understand both the technical process and the human challenges associated with change.

When workflow ownership is clearly established, improvements continue long after the project team has left.

Authority

Authority defines who has the legitimate power to make decisions, allocate resources and direct work. During major change, authority often shifts as organisations redesign governance structures and adopt more integrated ways of working.

OCM recognises that changes in authority can generate uncertainty, resistance and political tension. Employees who previously exercised significant discretion may perceive a loss of influence, while others may suddenly be expected to make decisions they have never made before.

Successful change programmes openly communicate these changes rather than allowing assumptions to develop. Leaders should explain not only what authority has changed, but why those changes better support organisational objectives.

Authority should also be supported through capability development. Granting decision-making authority without providing knowledge, confidence and support places individuals in difficult positions and increases organisational risk.

When authority is aligned with accountability, responsibility and capability, people are empowered to make timely, informed decisions that support the organisation's future state.

Cross-functional collaboration

Enterprise Asset Management is inherently cross-functional. Very few asset management activities occur entirely within a single department. Planning involves Operations, Maintenance, Engineering and Supply Chain. Shutdowns require coordination across numerous business units. Asset information flows between design, construction, maintenance, finance and operations.

From an OCM perspective, improving cross-functional collaboration is often one of the greatest opportunities presented by an EAM implementation. The technology provides a common source of information, but collaboration depends upon relationships, trust, shared objectives and effective communication.

Successful organisations deliberately design collaboration into the future operating model. They establish common governance forums, shared performance measures, integrated planning processes and mechanisms for resolving competing priorities. They also recognise and reward behaviours that support enterprise outcomes rather than departmental optimisation.

Change practitioners play an important role in facilitating these relationships throughout the implementation. Workshops, process design sessions, stakeholder engagement and leadership alignment activities all help build mutual understanding before the system goes live.

Ultimately, mature asset management organisations stop thinking in terms of departments and begin thinking in terms of end-to-end business outcomes. Cross-functional collaboration is not merely a desirable behaviour; it is a defining characteristic of high-performing organisations. It also reaffirms the organisation's coordinated activity.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations

New ways of working succeed when roles and expectations are clearly understood.	Changes to responsibilities should be formally reviewed before implementation.
Accountability should be reinforced through behaviours rather than organisational charts alone.	Decision rights should align with approved governance frameworks.
Cross-functional collaboration creates greater value than functional optimisation.	Operational authority should be clearly defined to avoid conflicting decisions.
Workflow ownership encourages continuous improvement and shared accountability.	New workflows should include appropriate approvals and risk controls.
Organisations change when daily routines change, not when policies change.	Changes affecting operational responsibilities should be documented and communicated before go-live.
Leadership should model the behaviours expected within the future operating model.	Governance should ensure operational consistency across regions, sites and business units.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Design
Also Supports	Deliver
Why it matters	New roles, responsibilities and behaviours must be designed before they can be embedded.

Changing the system is often easier than changing the organisation's decision structure.

New ways of working will not remain sustainable if workflow ownership, decision rights and authority are unclear. When these are poorly defined, issues are delayed, exceptions are unmanaged, and accountability becomes fragmented across functions.

In my experience, operational discipline improves when governance evolves alongside the process, not after it. (Peter)

Chapter 13 - Data and Information Maturity

Information is one of an organisation's most valuable assets, yet unlike physical assets it cannot be seen, touched or maintained with a spanner. It is created every time work is performed, assets are inspected, decisions are made, and lessons are learned. In an asset-intensive organisation, the journey from raw data to informed decision-making is what enables assets to be managed safely, efficiently and sustainably throughout their lifecycle. Data records what has happened. Information provides context. Knowledge develops through experience and understanding. Insight emerges when patterns are recognised, and informed decisions are made when all of these elements come together in support of organisational objectives. Enterprise Asset

Management depends on this progression because every maintenance decision, capital investment, operational intervention and strategic priority is ultimately based on the confidence people have in the information available to them.

Organisational Change Management and the Management of Change both play critical roles in building this confidence, albeit from different perspectives. OCM focuses on creating a culture where people value accurate information, understand their responsibility to maintain it, and use trusted information to guide their daily decisions. It helps transform data from an administrative obligation into a strategic organisational asset. Management of Change complements this by ensuring that information remains aligned with the physical world whenever assets, processes, systems or organisational structures change. Together, they create the conditions for digital trust, in which operators, maintainers, engineers, planners, executives, and board members can all make decisions with confidence because they are working from a consistent, reliable, and governed source of truth. Organisations that achieve this maturity no longer rely solely on instinct, isolated spreadsheets, or local knowledge; they combine human experience with trusted information to make better decisions at every level of the organisation.

Asset data

Every Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation ultimately succeeds or fails on the quality of its asset data. It does not matter how sophisticated the software is if the organisation cannot trust the information describing the assets it is responsible for maintaining. Asset data is far more than a register of equipment. It represents the collective understanding of what exists, where it exists, how it is configured, its condition, the risks it presents, and how it should be maintained throughout its life.

From an Organisational Change Management perspective, improving asset data is fundamentally about changing behaviours. People who previously viewed data entry as an administrative burden must begin to see it as an operational responsibility. Technicians need confidence that recording accurate maintenance history has value. Engineers need to understand why asset hierarchies matter. Supervisors need to reinforce expectations around data quality, while leaders must demonstrate that decisions are actually made using trusted information.

Management of Change becomes equally important because asset information changes whenever the physical asset changes. New equipment is installed, assets are relocated, components are replaced, operating parameters change, and assets are decommissioned. Every physical change must trigger a corresponding change in information. If this discipline is absent, the digital representation quickly diverges from reality.

This is where configuration management becomes essential. Good configuration management ensures that the physical asset, its documentation, maintenance strategies, drawings, spare parts, digital records and associated risk information all remain aligned. Organisations often treat configuration management as an engineering activity, but in reality it is one of the strongest foundations of reliable asset information.

Asset data maturity is therefore not measured by how much information exists, but by how consistently the organisation maintains the accuracy of that information throughout the asset lifecycle.

Master data

Master data provides the common language used across the organisation. Equipment classes, locations, failure codes, work order types, maintenance plans, vendors, employees, cost centres and spare parts all rely upon master data remaining consistent.

Many EAM implementations spend months cleansing master data before go-live, only to allow inconsistent practices immediately afterwards. The implementation team celebrates clean data while the operational business slowly recreates the same problems that existed before.

OCM focuses on helping people understand why standards matter. It is about building discipline around requesting new values, following naming conventions and resisting the temptation to create duplicates simply because it is quicker. These are behavioural changes rather than technical ones.

Management of Change ensures that changes to master data are controlled. New classifications, new equipment types or revised coding structures should never be introduced informally. They should follow governance processes, impact assessments, and approval workflows, as changes to master data affect reporting, integrations, analytics, and business processes.

Good configuration management supports this discipline by ensuring that changes to master data remain compatible with engineering standards, maintenance strategies and other enterprise systems. A poorly governed master data environment gradually erodes confidence in every report the organisation produces.

Master data maturity is therefore less about having comprehensive lists and more about maintaining stability while allowing controlled evolution.

Reference data

Reference data provides the standard values that allow information to be interpreted consistently. Failure modes, criticality ratings, condition codes, status values, work priorities and measurement units are all examples of reference data.

Unlike transactional information, reference data changes relatively infrequently, but when it does, the consequences can be significant. Changing a criticality scale, introducing new failure classifications or redefining work priorities affects historical reporting, dashboards and operational decision-making.

From an OCM perspective, users need confidence that everyone is speaking the same language. When maintenance planners interpret priorities differently, or engineers classify failures inconsistently, the organisation loses the ability to compare performance across sites or business units.

Management of Change introduces the governance required whenever reference data evolves. Proposed changes should be evaluated for downstream impacts, communicated broadly and supported through training before implementation.

Reference data often receives little attention because it appears static. In reality, it quietly underpins every decision the organisation makes. Mature organisations treat reference data as a strategic asset rather than a simple lookup table.

Configuration

Configuration is often misunderstood as an IT term describing software settings. Within Enterprise Asset Management, it is much broader. Configuration describes the controlled relationships among services, functions, physical assets, engineering documentation, maintenance requirements, business processes, software settings, and organisational responsibilities.

OCM helps people understand why standard configuration benefits everyone. Local customisation may feel convenient, but excessive variation increases complexity, training effort and long-term support costs.

Management of Change governs how configuration evolves over time. Whether changing maintenance workflows, introducing new approval paths or modifying equipment hierarchies, every configuration change should be assessed for operational, safety and business impacts before deployment.

Good configuration management ensures changes remain documented, tested, approved and traceable. It creates confidence that today's system accurately reflects today's business rather than the business that existed several years ago.

Configuration maturity is achieved when change becomes controlled rather than avoided.

Information quality

Information quality is measured by more than accuracy. Complete, timely, consistent, relevant and accessible information all contribute to organisational confidence.

One of the biggest surprises during EAM implementations is discovering that people have learned to compensate for poor information. They know which fields can be ignored, which reports are unreliable and which spreadsheets contain the "real" numbers. These workarounds become deeply embedded within organisational culture.

OCM focuses on rebuilding trust. If people do not believe the information is reliable, they will continue using shadow systems regardless of how much effort has been invested in the new platform.

Management of Change ensures that information quality remains protected whenever business processes, asset configurations or operating practices change. Every operational change potentially affects data quality.

Information quality is ultimately maintained through everyday behaviours rather than periodic cleansing exercises.

Ownership

One of the simplest questions often produces the longest silence.

"Who owns this data?"

Technology teams frequently assume the business owns the data. Operational teams often assume that IT owns the system and, by extension, the data. Consultants may define governance models, but unless ownership becomes embedded within operational accountability, nobody accepts responsibility.

OCM helps establish ownership by integrating data stewardship into core business roles. Ownership should exist at executive, process and operational levels, with each understanding their responsibilities.

Management of Change reinforces ownership whenever organisational structures, responsibilities or asset portfolios change. Ownership should transfer deliberately rather than accidentally.

Clear ownership creates accountability. Accountability creates better decisions. Better decisions create better data.

Metadata

Metadata is often described as "data about data," but in practice it provides context. It explains where information originated, who created it, when it was updated, how it should be interpreted and how reliable it is.

As organisations become increasingly digital, metadata becomes essential for traceability and auditability. It builds confidence in analytics, artificial intelligence, and automated decision-making.

OCM encourages people to understand that documenting information properly improves its future value. Management of Change ensures metadata remains accurate whenever systems, processes or information structures evolve.

Metadata is largely invisible when managed well, yet its absence becomes painfully obvious when organisations attempt to investigate incidents, validate reports or explain historical decisions.

Standards

Standards allow thousands of people to work together consistently.

Whether adopting ISO 55000, ISO 14224, ISO 19650 engineering naming conventions or corporate information standards, consistency reduces ambiguity and enables reliable reporting across the enterprise.

OCM focuses on gaining adoption rather than simply publishing standards. Employees need to understand why standards exist, not merely where they are documented.

Management of Change ensures standards evolve under governance rather than through local interpretation. Changes to standards should be assessed, communicated and supported with appropriate training.

Standards should never become bureaucratic constraints. Their purpose is to enable consistency while supporting operational effectiveness.

Information governance

Information governance defines how information is created, approved, maintained, protected and ultimately retired.

Many organisations invest heavily in technology while investing very little in governance. As a result, information quality slowly deteriorates until confidence is lost.

OCM helps governance become part of organisational culture. Governance should be viewed as enabling better decisions rather than policing compliance.

Management of Change ensures governance adapts as the business changes. New technologies, acquisitions, regulatory requirements and operating models all require governance frameworks to evolve without losing control.

Effective governance creates clarity about decision rights, ownership, escalation pathways and accountability across the organisation.

Data lifecycle

Data has its own lifecycle that closely mirrors that of the physical asset.

Information is created, validated, enriched, maintained, archived and eventually retired. Unfortunately, many organisations only focus on the creation phase.

OCM encourages employees to recognise that maintaining information is an ongoing operational activity rather than a project deliverable.

Management of Change ensures lifecycle processes are updated whenever new business processes, technologies or organisational structures emerge. Data should never outlive its usefulness nor disappear before it is no longer required.

Mature organisations manage information with the same discipline they apply to managing physical assets.

Migration readiness

Data migration is frequently described as a technical exercise. In reality, successful migration is one of the largest organisational change activities within an EAM implementation.

Migration readiness is about much more than cleansing spreadsheets. It requires agreement on ownership, business rules, acceptance criteria, validation processes and ongoing governance.

OCM prepares the business to make difficult decisions about what information should be migrated, corrected, archived or discarded. These decisions often expose conflicting assumptions between departments.

Management of Change ensures migration activities do not compromise operational continuity. Legacy systems may continue operating alongside new platforms during transition, requiring disciplined control of information changes.

Migration readiness is achieved when the organisation is confident not only that the data is technically correct, but that the business trusts it enough to operate with it from day one.

Digital trust / Source of Truth

Every organisation claims to have a "single source of truth."

Very few actually do.

Instead, they have multiple systems containing slightly different versions of the same information, each trusted by different groups of people. Engineers trust drawings. Operations trust spreadsheets. Finance trusts ERP. Maintenance trusts the EAM. Nobody fully trusts all of them.

OCM recognises that digital trust is earned rather than mandated. People only abandon local spreadsheets when enterprise information consistently proves more reliable.

Management of Change protects that trust whenever systems, assets or business processes change. Every change should preserve alignment between the physical world and its digital representation.

Configuration management plays a central role by ensuring that physical assets, documentation, engineering records, maintenance information and enterprise systems remain synchronised. Without disciplined configuration management, the concept of a single source of truth quickly becomes a slogan rather than a reality.

Ultimately, digital trust is not built by software. It is built by people who consistently maintain accurate information, follow agreed governance, and treat data as a critical organisational asset. When that happens, the EAM system becomes more than a database; it becomes the trusted foundation for operational decision-making across the enterprise.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Data quality is ultimately a people responsibility supported by technology.	Asset information should remain accurate throughout every approved operational change.
Organisations become information-driven when people trust the data they use.	Configuration management protects the integrity of both physical and digital assets.
Ownership encourages accountability for maintaining information quality.	Changes to critical asset information should follow established governance processes.
Information governance succeeds when it is embedded in everyday work practices.	Data standards reduce operational risk by ensuring consistency across the organisation.
Migration readiness depends as much on business ownership as technical preparation.	Metadata provides traceability that supports audits, investigations and compliance.

Trusted information enables confident decisions across the entire asset lifecycle.	Information maturity strengthens operational decision-making by ensuring data remains reliable and controlled.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Design
Also Supports	Discover, Deliver
Why it matters	Information maturity influences solution quality, migration readiness and long-term asset decision-making.

I've always enjoyed helping organisations imagine what they could become rather than simply documenting what they are today. But I've also learnt that future-state design only succeeds when the people who will ultimately live with it are actively involved in creating it. The best operating models are not designed in meeting rooms; they are shaped through collaboration with the people who understand the work.

One of my biggest lessons has been that technology should enable better business capability, never define it. Whenever software starts driving organisational decisions, I know we've begun solving the wrong problem. (Martin)

I've come to see data maturity as a reflection of organisational maturity. Organisations with clear ownership, consistent governance and disciplined business processes almost always have better information. Those struggling with accountability usually struggle with data as well. Data quality is rarely a technology problem; it's an organisational behaviour. Improving maturity means improving the way the organisation creates, validates, manages and trusts information throughout its lifecycle. (Peter)

Part Five - Preparing the Organisation

Chapter 14 - Change Strategy

Every successful Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation begins with a technology strategy, but very few succeed solely on that. They succeed because a deliberate change strategy sits alongside it. The change strategy provides the blueprint for how people, leaders, teams and the organisation will move from the current state to the future state. Without it, even the best-designed EAM solution becomes another system that people reluctantly use rather than enthusiastically adopt.

From an asset management perspective, the objective is not simply to implement software. The objective is to improve how assets are planned, maintained, operated and renewed throughout their lifecycle. Achieving this requires changes to behaviours, decision-making, governance, accountability, information quality, and organisational

culture. The change strategy ensures these elements evolve together rather than independently.

A good change strategy answers questions such as:

- Why are we changing?
- What will success look like?
- Who will be impacted?
- What capabilities need to change?
- What resistance can we expect?
- How will leadership support the journey?
- How will adoption and benefits be measured?

One common mistake organisations make is treating change management as a communications plan or a training schedule. These are important activities, but they are outputs of the strategy, not the strategy itself. The strategy should shape every decision throughout the program, from business process design and data governance through to leadership engagement and post-go-live support.

The principles of good asset management closely align with those of good change management. Both emphasise long-term value over short-term fixes, clear accountability over ambiguity, evidence-based decision-making over assumptions, and continuous improvement rather than one-off projects. A strong change strategy deliberately reinforces these principles so that the implementation delivers not just a new system, but a stronger asset management capability.

Vision

People rarely become excited about implementing software. They become excited about solving problems, making work easier, reducing risk and creating a better future. This is the purpose of the change vision.

A vision paints a picture of what the organisation will look like once the transformation is complete. It explains not just what is changing, but why it matters. For an EAM implementation, that vision may include safer operations, better reliability, trusted asset information, improved planning, greater collaboration between departments and more informed investment decisions.

The vision should be simple enough for every employee to understand while meaningful enough for executives to see how it supports organisational strategy. If different leaders describe different futures, confusion quickly follows. Consistency is therefore one of the most powerful tools available to change leaders.

From an asset management perspective, the vision should also align with recognised principles such as lifecycle thinking, risk-based decision-making, continual improvement, and value creation. The EAM system becomes an enabler of these principles rather than the vision itself.

An effective vision also recognises that different stakeholder groups interpret success differently. Executives may focus on investment optimisation and governance. Maintenance planners may value improved scheduling. Field technicians may want

less paperwork and easier access to accurate information. Finance may seek confidence in asset values and lifecycle costs. The vision needs to connect these different perspectives into one shared destination.

Ultimately, people support what they understand and believe in. A compelling vision transforms an IT project into an organisational journey.

Guiding principles

Every large transformation faces hundreds of decisions throughout its lifecycle. Some decisions are technical, others operational, while many involve competing priorities between different stakeholder groups. Guiding principles provide the consistent foundation for making those decisions.

Rather than creating detailed rules for every situation, guiding principles establish the values that should influence decisions. They become the "north star" that keeps the program aligned even when circumstances change.

Examples of guiding principles for an EAM implementation might include:

- Business processes before system customisation.
- Standardise wherever practical.
- Data is treated as a corporate asset.
- Safety and risk always outweigh convenience.
- Decisions should support the entire asset lifecycle.
- Technology should simplify work, not create additional effort.
- Change should be sustainable beyond project completion.

These principles reflect both asset management and organisational change management. Asset management promotes consistency, lifecycle optimisation, governance and evidence-based decisions. Change management promotes clarity, transparency, engagement and shared ownership. Together they encourage behaviours that extend well beyond system implementation.

Guiding principles are particularly valuable when difficult compromises arise. For example, a business unit may request significant software customisation to preserve an existing local process. If one of the agreed principles is "adopt standard processes unless there is a compelling business justification," then the decision becomes far easier and less political.

When consistently reinforced by leadership, guiding principles gradually become cultural norms that shape future decision-making long after the project has finished.

Roadmap

Transformation does not occur in a single event. It is a journey made up of many interconnected milestones. The roadmap provides visibility of that journey and helps people understand where they are today, what comes next and how progress will be measured.

An implementation roadmap is often presented as a project schedule, but from an organisational change perspective it is much more than that. It should demonstrate how people, processes, technology, governance, data and capability mature over time.

For an EAM implementation, the roadmap may include activities such as organisational readiness, process design, data cleansing, asset hierarchy development, leadership engagement, training, testing, deployment, hypercare and continuous improvement. Importantly, these activities should not be viewed as isolated workstreams but as interconnected components of organisational transformation.

Asset management itself is built around lifecycle thinking. Assets are planned, acquired, operated, maintained and eventually retired. Similarly, organisational change follows a lifecycle of awareness, understanding, acceptance, adoption and optimisation. A good roadmap recognises both lifecycles and ensures they progress together.

The roadmap should also acknowledge that not every part of the organisation moves at the same pace. Operational sites, corporate functions, and contractors often require varying levels of support and timelines. Flexibility in the roadmap allows these differences to be accommodated while maintaining the overall program direction.

A roadmap provides confidence because it demonstrates that change is being managed deliberately rather than occurring by chance.

Governance

Governance is often misunderstood as meetings, steering committees and approval processes. While these are components of governance, they are not its purpose. Good governance ensures that decisions are made by the right people, using the right information, at the right time and in alignment with organisational objectives.

Within Enterprise Asset Management, governance is fundamental. It determines ownership of asset information, approval of maintenance strategies, investment priorities, process standards and compliance obligations. Without governance, different parts of the organisation naturally begin creating their own ways of working, reducing consistency and increasing operational risk.

From an organisational change perspective, governance also provides confidence during uncertainty. Employees are more willing to embrace change when they understand who is making decisions and why.

Effective governance typically defines:

- Decision rights.
- Roles and responsibilities.
- Escalation pathways.
- Standards and policies.
- Risk management.
- Benefit ownership.
- Performance monitoring.

One important principle is that governance should enable decisions rather than delay them. Excessive governance creates bureaucracy, while insufficient governance creates inconsistency. Finding the appropriate balance is one of the defining characteristics of successful transformation programs.

Ultimately, governance protects the integrity of both the asset management framework and the organisational change journey.

Change governance

Project governance ensures the project is delivered. Change governance ensures the organisation is changing.

Although these two forms of governance overlap, they focus on different outcomes. Project governance typically measures scope, schedule, budget, risks and deliverables. Change governance measures organisational readiness, stakeholder engagement, leadership effectiveness, capability development, adoption, behavioural change and benefit realisation.

Both are essential for successful EAM implementations.

Change governance provides structured oversight of the human side of transformation. It asks questions such as:

- Are people ready for the next phase?
- Is resistance increasing or decreasing?
- Are leaders fulfilling their change responsibilities?
- Is training translating into new behaviours?
- Are new business processes being consistently adopted?
- Are expected benefits beginning to emerge?

Importantly, change governance should be evidence-based. Surveys, adoption metrics, training completion, stakeholder feedback, operational performance and behavioural observations all provide valuable insights into whether the organisation is genuinely transitioning to the future state.

Strong change governance also ensures accountability extends beyond go-live. Many organisations declare success once the system is operational, yet true success is only achieved when the new ways of working become business as usual and measurable business value is consistently realised.

In mature organisations, project governance and change governance operate together. One ensures the solution is delivered correctly. The other ensures the organisation is prepared to use it successfully. Only when both are functioning effectively does an EAM implementation achieve its full potential and establish the foundations for long-term asset management excellence.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations

Preparation begins long before training or deployment activities commence.	Every operational change should be supported by an approved implementation strategy.
A clear vision provides direction when projects encounter uncertainty.	Governance structures should be established before implementation activities begin.
Change strategies should evolve as organisational understanding matures.	Operational risks should be continuously reviewed throughout the implementation planning process.
Executive engagement builds confidence throughout the organisation.	Decision-making authority should be clearly defined before operational changes are introduced.
Guiding principles help teams make consistent decisions throughout the program.	Implementation plans should include contingency arrangements to protect business continuity.
Organisations prepare successfully when people understand both the destination and the journey.	Effective preparation reduces operational disruption during deployment and transition.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Deliver
Also Supports	Discover, Define, Design, Depart
Why it matters	Communication is a continuous leadership activity that builds understanding, trust and sustained engagement.

A strategy should explain how the organisation will remain operational while it changes. It defines the governing choices, principles and controls that will guide the transformation.

From a Management of Change perspective, the strategy should provide confidence that governance, operational risk, decision-making, business continuity and organisational capability have been considered. The roadmap then sequences the major stages and dependencies, while implementation and delivery plans convert that direction into executable activities.

A well-developed strategy gives leaders confidence that change is being introduced deliberately rather than being delivered quickly. (Peter)

Chapter 15 – Communications

One of the biggest misconceptions in Organisational Change Management is that communication is the same thing as change management. It is not. Communication is an important capability within OCM, but by itself it changes very little.

Many organisations proudly develop communication plans filled with newsletters, emails, town halls, intranet updates and posters. Months later, they wonder why people are still confused, resistant, or continue to work the old way. The problem is

rarely that the message was sent. The problem is that the message was never truly received, understood, believed or translated into action.

Effective communication is measured by what people understand, not by what the project publishes.

Within Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementations, this distinction becomes critical. Maintenance planners, supervisors, reliability engineers, warehouse staff and field technicians all experience change differently. Sending the same message to everyone may satisfy the project plan, but it rarely addresses what each audience actually needs to know.

Communication therefore becomes an ongoing conversation rather than a broadcasting exercise.

Good communication answers questions people rarely ask directly.

- Why are we changing?
- Why now?
- Why this solution?
- Why should I care?
- What changes for me?
- What stays the same?
- What support will I receive?
- How will success be measured?

The answers evolve throughout the project as understanding increases.

OCM practitioners spend as much time checking understanding as they do creating communications. They observe conversations, attend meetings, visit operational teams, listen for misconceptions and adjust messages accordingly. Sometimes success means rewriting a message entirely because people interpreted it differently from how it was intended.

The goal is not awareness.

The goal is shared understanding that leads to new behaviours.

Communication strategy

A communication strategy is much more than a schedule of emails and presentations. It is a deliberate plan to build understanding, confidence, and commitment throughout the lifecycle of change.

Every successful communication strategy begins by recognising that different audiences need different conversations.

- Executives require messages that focus on business outcomes, investment value, and strategic alignment.
- Middle managers need clarity about decision-making, priorities, performance expectations and leadership responsibilities.

- Frontline workers need practical information about how their work will change tomorrow morning.
- Technical teams need confidence that systems, data and processes will support them.

Trying to satisfy everyone with one communication almost always satisfies no one.

A strong communication strategy also recognises that communication follows the emotional journey of change.

Early communications focus on creating awareness and explaining why change is necessary.

As the project progresses, communication shifts toward preparing people for what is coming.

During implementation, communication becomes practical and operational.

After go-live, it focuses on reinforcing success, recognising achievements and helping people build confidence in the new ways of working.

Perhaps the most overlooked part of a communication strategy is verification.

Rather than asking, "Did we send the communication?" successful OCM teams ask:

- What did people understand?
- What misconceptions still exist?
- Where is uncertainty increasing?
- What questions remain unanswered?
- Which audiences require additional support?

The strategy becomes a living process that continuously adapts as the organisation learns.

Operational messaging

Strategic messages create understanding.

Operational messages create action.

Operational messaging explains exactly what people need to do differently in their everyday work.

Within an EAM implementation, this might include changes to work order management, planning processes, asset registration, failure coding, inventory management or approval workflows.

People generally ask practical questions:

- "What changes when I log into the system tomorrow?"
- "What happens if I don't complete this field?"
- "Who approves this now?"
- "Where do I find the information?"
- "When do I stop using Excel?"

Operational communication removes ambiguity.

It provides clear instructions, examples, demonstrations, checklists and practical scenarios that help people confidently perform their work.

Timing is equally important.

Providing detailed operational instructions six months before go-live creates confusion because people forget.

Providing them one week after go-live creates frustration because people already needed the information.

Effective OCM delivers operational communication when people are ready to use it.

It also recognises that different operational groups require different levels of detail.

A maintenance scheduler needs different information from a procurement officer.

A reliability engineer requires different guidance from a warehouse operator.

Operational messaging succeeds when people know exactly what to do without needing to interpret project documentation.

Active Listening

Communication begins with listening.

Unfortunately, many projects spend considerably more effort talking than listening.

Active listening is one of the most valuable skills an OCM practitioner can develop.

It involves genuinely seeking to understand people's concerns rather than waiting for an opportunity to respond.

When employees express frustration, resistance or scepticism, they are often communicating valuable information about the organisation rather than opposing the project itself.

Their concerns may reveal:

- unclear processes
- poor data quality
- unrealistic expectations
- workload pressures
- leadership inconsistency
- previous project failures
- capability gaps
- organisational politics

These insights frequently identify risks long before traditional project reporting.

Active listening also helps distinguish between resistance and legitimate operational concerns.

A technician questioning a new inspection workflow may not be resisting change.

They may be identifying a safety issue that the design team overlooked.

People support change more readily when they feel heard.

Even when their suggestions cannot be adopted, taking time to understand their perspective builds trust and demonstrates respect.

Listening therefore becomes a strategic capability rather than simply a communication technique.

Feedback

Feedback is the mechanism that allows organisational change to continuously improve.

Without feedback, projects operate on assumptions.

With feedback, projects adapt.

Many projects collect feedback through surveys, but surveys alone rarely provide the complete picture.

Useful feedback comes from multiple sources:

- Workshops
- Focus groups
- Site visits
- Team meetings
- Leadership conversations
- Champion networks
- Training sessions
- Help desk trends
- Observation of work practices

The value lies not in collecting feedback but in responding to it.

Nothing damages engagement faster than repeatedly asking for feedback and never acting upon it.

Where possible, projects should close the feedback loop by explaining:

- what was heard
- what actions were taken
- why some suggestions could not be implemented
- what will happen next

This transparency builds confidence that participation matters.

Feedback also provides an early measure of organisational readiness.

Increasing confidence, fewer misconceptions and improved understanding usually indicate that change adoption is progressing.

Increasing confusion or repeated questions often signal that communication, training or leadership engagement requires adjustment.

Two-way engagement

The most successful organisational change programs replace communication with conversation.

Two-way engagement recognises that employees are not passive recipients of change.

They are active participants in shaping how change succeeds.

This shift fundamentally changes the role of communication.

Instead of asking, "How do we tell people?"

OCM asks,

"How do we involve people?"

Within EAM implementations, two-way engagement may include design workshops, process reviews, prototype demonstrations, pilot groups, champion networks, lessons learned sessions and continuous improvement forums.

- Participation creates ownership.
- Ownership creates commitment.
- Commitment drives adoption.

Two-way engagement also surfaces valuable operational knowledge that rarely exists within project teams.

- Operators understand shortcuts.
- Schedulers understand bottlenecks.
- Maintainers understand equipment behaviour.
- Warehouse teams understand inventory realities.

These practical insights often improve the final solution while simultaneously increasing acceptance.

Ultimately, the objective is not simply to communicate change.

It is to create an environment where people understand the reasons for change, contribute to its design, influence its improvement and confidently adopt new ways of working.

That is the difference between managing communications and managing organisational change.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Communication succeeds when understanding is achieved, not merely when information is distributed.	Critical operational communications should follow approved governance pathways.

Different audiences require different messages, even when supporting the same change.	Safety and operational instructions should remain consistent across all communication channels.
Listening is often more valuable than broadcasting messages.	Formal change notifications should be issued before altering operational procedures.
Honest communication builds trust during periods of uncertainty.	Operational stakeholders should receive timely advice regarding approved changes.
Leaders communicate through their actions as much as their words.	Regulatory and compliance communications should remain accurate, controlled and traceable.
Two-way communication creates ownership and strengthens organisational commitment.	Effective communication reduces the likelihood of operational misunderstanding during implementation.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Deliver
Also Supports	Discover, Define, Design, Depart
Why it matters	Communication is a continuous leadership activity that builds understanding, trust and sustained engagement.

Operational certainty is as important as organisational awareness.

People need absolute clarity about when an approved procedure has changed, who authorised it, which version applies and where questions must be escalated. In operational environments, unclear or inconsistent information introduces risk.

Good Management of Change ensures critical instructions are accurate, traceable, approved and issued through authoritative channels. Every project interaction should reinforce the agreed operational position rather than create competing interpretations. (Peter)

Chapter 16 - Learning and Capability

One of the most common misconceptions in Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementations is that training equals organisational readiness. It does not. Training teaches people how to use a system, while capability uplift ensures they can perform their role effectively in a changed operating environment. Organisational Change Management (OCM) focuses on building sustainable capability, not simply delivering courses before go-live. True learning combines knowledge, practical application, confidence, reinforcement and continuous improvement. The objective is not for people to remember where to click in the software, but to understand why they are working differently, how the EAM supports better asset management, and what success looks like in their role.

Capability uplift/development should begin early in the program, well before formal training commences. It starts by understanding current skills, identifying future capability requirements, and designing learning experiences that progressively build knowledge over the life of the project. The most successful organisations view learning as a journey that continues well beyond implementation, supporting adoption, optimisation and long-term business maturity.

Training Needs Analysis – EAM System

A Training Needs Analysis (TNA) for an EAM implementation identifies what people need to know to perform their roles within the new system. Rather than assuming everyone requires the same training, an effective TNA examines different job roles, responsibilities, levels of system interaction and business scenarios. A maintenance planner requires different knowledge from that of a warehouse officer, asset engineer, field technician, or finance analyst.

From an OCM perspective, the analysis extends beyond mere identification of software functions. It considers what decisions people need to make, which business processes they participate in, the information they require, and how often they perform particular tasks. Someone who creates work orders daily requires a higher level of competency than an executive who only reviews dashboards each month.

A well-executed TNA prevents both over-training and under-training. It reduces cognitive overload, improves learner engagement, and ensures that training time focuses on activities that genuinely improve business performance rather than on demonstrating every available software feature.

Training Needs Analysis – Asset Management

Implementing an EAM often exposes a more fundamental issue: many organisations need to strengthen their asset management capability as much as their software capability. People may know how to navigate a system but still lack an understanding of concepts such as asset lifecycle management, criticality, preventive maintenance strategies, failure reporting, or risk-based decision-making.

An Asset Management Training Needs Analysis identifies these broader capability gaps. It assesses understanding of standards, business processes, maintenance philosophies, data quality expectations and organisational responsibilities. This learning is often independent of the software itself.

Without strengthening asset management capability, organisations risk automating poor practices. OCM therefore seeks to build both technical system competence and professional asset management capability, recognising that sustainable change depends on improving both.

Different ways of learning

People learn differently, and effective change programs recognise that no single learning method suits everyone. Traditional classroom training remains valuable for introducing concepts and encouraging discussion, but it is only one component of a broader learning ecosystem.

Modern learning combines instructor-led sessions, eLearning, interactive simulations, practical exercises, coaching, mentoring, job shadowing, workshops, peer learning and self-paced resources. Adults learn most effectively by doing, reflecting and immediately applying new knowledge within their work environment.

OCM also recognises that learning continues after go-live. Floor walking, hypercare support, communities of practice, knowledge-sharing sessions, and regular refresher training often have a greater long-term impact than the initial training courses themselves. The objective is continuous capability development rather than one-off knowledge transfer.

Competency

Competency is demonstrated capability, not simply attendance at training. A person becomes competent when they consistently perform their role safely, efficiently and confidently within the new operating model.

For an EAM implementation, competency spans multiple dimensions. It includes technical system knowledge, understanding of asset management principles, business process execution, decision-making, data quality, compliance responsibilities, and collaboration across functional boundaries.

Leading organisations define competency expectations for each role and assess whether individuals have achieved them through practical demonstration rather than simply completing a course. OCM helps establish competency frameworks that support both implementation success and long-term workforce development.

Learning pathways

Learning pathways recognise that capability develops progressively rather than through isolated training events. Instead of delivering every course immediately before go-live, organisations sequence learning to align with project milestones and increasing organisational readiness.

An effective pathway might begin with awareness of why the organisation is changing, followed by introductions to future business processes, asset management concepts, role-specific system training, practical exercises, supervised workplace application and ongoing coaching after implementation.

Learning pathways also support career development. As organisations mature their asset management capability, employees can progressively develop advanced knowledge in planning, reliability, engineering, analytics or leadership, reinforcing a culture of continuous professional growth.

Role-based training

One of the quickest ways to disengage learners is to provide training that is irrelevant to their role. Role-based training focuses on what individuals actually need to perform their work rather than exposing everyone to every function within the EAM.

Training should be built around real business scenarios using realistic organisational data. A maintenance supervisor should practise approving work, managing resources

and monitoring backlog. A technician should complete inspections, record defects and close work orders. Warehouse personnel should manage inventory transactions and reservations. Executives should learn how to interpret dashboards and make informed decisions.

This practical approach increases confidence because learners immediately recognise how the new system supports their daily responsibilities rather than presenting software as a collection of disconnected screens.

Performance support

Even the best training cannot prepare people for every situation they will encounter after go-live. Performance support provides assistance at the point of need, enabling people to complete tasks accurately without relying solely on memory.

Examples include quick reference guides, digital knowledge bases, embedded help within the EAM, process maps, decision trees, short instructional videos, FAQs, AI-enabled assistants and support from local champions or super users.

Performance support reduces errors, shortens the learning curve and builds confidence during the critical adoption period. Within OCM, these resources are considered an essential extension of training rather than an optional extra.

Knowledge retention

The greatest learning challenge is rarely delivering training; it is ensuring knowledge is retained and translated into everyday practice. Without reinforcement, people quickly revert to familiar habits, particularly under operational pressure.

Knowledge retention is strengthened through repetition, practical application, coaching, leadership reinforcement, peer support and regular use of new processes. Organisations should monitor adoption metrics, identify capability gaps after go-live and provide targeted refresher learning where required.

Perhaps most importantly, knowledge should become organisational rather than individual. Standardised processes, documented procedures, communities of practice and structured knowledge management reduce reliance on a handful of experienced employees and protect organisational capability as people change roles or leave the business.

Ultimately, successful EAM implementations are measured not by how many people attended training, but by whether the organisation has developed the capability to manage its assets more effectively. Learning is therefore not a project activity that finishes at go-live; it is a strategic investment that enables lasting organisational change.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Learning should develop confidence, not simply complete training courses.	Competency requirements should be defined before individuals perform changed operational tasks.

Different people learn in different ways and at different speeds.	Operational competency should be verified before assigning new responsibilities.
Training should explain why work is changing and how to perform it.	Critical operational procedures should only be performed by appropriately trained personnel.
Capability develops through coaching, practice and experience.	Competency assessments provide assurance that operational risks are being effectively managed.
Knowledge retention requires ongoing reinforcement after go-live.	Training records provide evidence that governance obligations have been fulfilled.
Organisations become capable when learning becomes part of everyday work.	Maintaining competency is an ongoing operational responsibility rather than a project milestone.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Deliver
Also Supports	Depart
Why it matters	Capability development prepares people for go-live while supporting long-term organisational maturity.

I've learnt that competence is demonstrated, not assumed. Completing training doesn't necessarily mean someone is capable of performing safely in a new operating environment. Throughout my career, I've found that the greatest confidence comes from opportunities to practise, solve real problems, and apply their judgement under normal operating conditions. Management of Change isn't simply concerned with what people know; it seeks evidence that the organisation can perform consistently after the project team has left. (Peter)

Chapter 17 – Leadership

Leadership is often described as a communication exercise. In reality, leadership during an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) transformation is about creating certainty, alignment and accountability across the entire organisation. An EAM implementation is not an operations project, an IT project or a maintenance project. It is an organisational transformation that changes how decisions are made about assets, risk, investment, maintenance and performance.

One of the greatest mistakes organisations make is believing that convincing Operations to adopt the system is enough. While Operations will ultimately use much of the solution, they rarely control the organisational policies, investment priorities or governance that determine whether an EAM succeeds. If executive leaders continue making decisions that contradict the new ways of working, no amount of frontline enthusiasm will overcome that inconsistency.

Leadership therefore begins with genuine executive commitment. The Executive Team must collectively agree why the organisation is investing in EAM and what success

looks like. More importantly, they must continue demonstrating that commitment long after the project kick-off. Employees quickly notice when leaders lose interest after approving the budget.

Strong leaders also recognise that change is uncomfortable. Rather than expecting people to embrace new systems, they acknowledge uncertainty, answer difficult questions and remain consistent in their messaging. They reinforce that the change is about improving organisational capability, not simply implementing software.

Leadership at every level should consistently reinforce the same themes:

- Asset management is a strategic business capability.
- Better information leads to better decisions.
- Standardisation creates organisational resilience.
- Data quality is everyone's responsibility.

The system supports business decisions rather than replacing professional judgement.

When leadership speaks with one voice, the organisation begins moving in one direction. When leaders send conflicting signals, people continue working as they always have.

Sponsor capability

Executive sponsorship is often reduced to attending steering committee meetings and approving project funding. Effective sponsorship is far more demanding. Sponsors become the visible owners of organisational change rather than simply the financial owners of the project.

A capable sponsor understands that their role extends well beyond governance. They remove organisational barriers, align competing business priorities, resolve conflicts between business units and continually reinforce why the change matters. They become the project's most influential advocate.

Many organisations appoint sponsors because of seniority rather than capability. Unfortunately, a highly respected executive who lacks the time, commitment or understanding of organisational change can unintentionally undermine the implementation. An absent sponsor creates uncertainty. People begin questioning whether the project is still important.

Sponsors should be capable of:

- Explaining the business rationale in simple language.
- Making timely decisions.
- Resolving organisational conflicts.
- Holding senior leaders accountable.
- Challenging resistance from peers.
- Celebrating progress publicly.
- Maintaining momentum throughout the programme.

Perhaps most importantly, sponsors should never position the EAM programme as "an Operations initiative." Doing so immediately limits organisational ownership. Instead, they should consistently reinforce that asset management supports finance, engineering, planning, procurement, projects, risk, safety, compliance and executive decision-making.

A capable sponsor does not simply endorse the project. They become the face of organisational commitment.

Manager capability

Middle managers often determine whether organisational change succeeds or quietly fails. They translate executive strategy into everyday operational behaviour and are usually the first people employees approach with concerns, frustrations or resistance.

Unfortunately, many managers receive little preparation before being expected to lead change. They may understand the technical aspects of the project but lack confidence in managing uncertainty, coaching staff or reinforcing new behaviours.

Manager capability should therefore become a deliberate component of the change strategy.

Managers need to understand:

- Why the organisation is changing.
- How their teams will be affected.
- What behaviours they are expected to reinforce.
- How success will be measured.
- How to deal with resistance constructively.
- When and how to escalate issues.

Managers also need confidence when discussing topics beyond the software itself. Staff rarely ask detailed configuration questions. Instead, they ask whether their jobs will change, whether existing knowledge will still matter and why long-standing practices are no longer acceptable.

Managers who cannot answer these questions unintentionally create anxiety.

Effective managers become coaches rather than controllers. They encourage learning, recognise progress and reinforce new behaviours through regular conversations rather than relying solely on formal training.

When managers actively support change, employees generally follow. When managers remain sceptical or disengaged, organisational resistance spreads rapidly.

Frontline leaders

Frontline leaders, supervisors, team leaders, planners, and coordinators have enormous influence because they shape daily behaviour. Employees often judge the importance of organisational change by watching how their immediate leader behaves rather than listening to executive presentations.

Frontline leaders bridge strategy and reality.

They understand how work is actually performed and recognise the practical challenges associated with implementing new processes. This makes them invaluable in identifying unintended consequences, local workarounds and opportunities for improvement.

However, frontline leaders can also become powerful sources of resistance if they feel excluded from the design process. They are frequently expected to enforce decisions they had little opportunity to influence.

Successful EAM programmes actively involve frontline leaders from the outset. Their operational knowledge improves solution design while simultaneously increasing ownership of the future state.

Frontline leaders should consistently reinforce behaviours such as:

- Completing work orders properly.
- Maintaining accurate asset data.
- Following standard workflows.
- Using the system rather than spreadsheets.
- Escalating process issues rather than creating workarounds.

People observe what frontline leaders tolerate. If shortcuts become acceptable, the entire organisation quickly returns to previous habits.

Visible leadership

One of the simplest indicators of executive commitment is visibility.

Employees quickly distinguish between leaders who genuinely support organisational change and those who merely approve funding. Visible leadership demonstrates that the initiative matters beyond the project team.

Visibility is not achieved through occasional speeches or launch events. It requires ongoing presence throughout the implementation.

Visible leaders:

- Attend workshops.
- Visit operational sites.
- Ask meaningful questions.
- Celebrate milestones.
- Acknowledge challenges honestly.
- Listen to employee concerns.
- Demonstrate curiosity about learning.

Importantly, visibility should continue after go-live. Many organisations celebrate implementation before people have actually changed how they work. Employees notice when executive attention disappears immediately after deployment.

Visible leadership reinforces that organisational change is an ongoing business priority rather than a temporary project.

Leadership presence builds trust because people see that executives remain engaged during both successes and setbacks.

Visible Asset Management Leadership

Visible leadership is important. Visible Asset Management Leadership is even more powerful.

Employees need to see senior leaders actively making decisions based on asset information, rather than treating asset management as a maintenance function. When executives ask about asset risk, lifecycle cost, maintenance effectiveness and asset performance using information from the EAM system, they demonstrate what good organisational decision-making looks like.

This shifts the conversation from:

"Has maintenance updated the work order?"

to

"What does our asset information tell us about investment decisions?"

Visible Asset Management Leadership includes:

- Discussing asset performance during executive meetings.
- Using EAM reporting in strategic reviews.
- Linking asset information to business planning.
- Recognising teams that improve information quality.
- Asking informed questions about asset risk and reliability.
- Demonstrating that data influences executive decisions.

This behaviour communicates that asset information has organisational value beyond maintenance reporting.

People naturally invest more effort in maintaining high-quality information when they see leaders relying on it.

Behaviour modelling

People believe what leaders do far more readily than what leaders say.

Behaviour modelling is therefore one of the most influential components of organisational change. Every leadership action either reinforces or undermines the desired culture.

If executives insist that all decisions should use EAM information but continue requesting spreadsheets, employees receive conflicting messages. If managers bypass agreed workflows because they are "too busy," staff conclude that following the new process is optional.

Behaviour modelling means leaders consistently demonstrate the behaviours they expect from others.

Examples include:

- Using standard reports.
- Following governance processes.
- Asking for evidence rather than opinions.
- Respecting agreed decision rights.
- Supporting cross-functional collaboration.
- Accepting constructive feedback.
- Demonstrating continuous learning.

Consistency builds organisational credibility.

Employees are remarkably skilled at identifying gaps between stated values and observed behaviours. The smaller that gap becomes, the faster organisational trust develops.

Coaching

Training teaches people how to use a system.

Coaching helps people succeed in a new way of working.

This distinction is fundamental to Organisational Change Management. Most EAM implementations invest heavily in classroom training but provide very little support once employees begin applying new skills in real operational environments.

Coaching occurs through regular conversations, observation, feedback and encouragement. It helps people move from knowing what to do to confidently doing it.

Effective coaching should occur at every leadership level.

Executives coach senior managers by reinforcing strategic priorities.

Managers coach supervisors by helping them navigate operational challenges.

Supervisors coach frontline teams by providing immediate feedback and recognising improvement.

Good coaching focuses on:

- Building confidence.
- Reinforcing desired behaviours.
- Solving practical problems.
- Encouraging reflection.
- Developing capability.
- Supporting continuous improvement.

Coaching also creates psychological safety. People become more willing to ask questions, admit mistakes and learn from experience without fear of blame.

An EAM implementation does not end when training finishes or when the system goes live. It succeeds when coaching has helped the new behaviours become the normal way the organisation works. At that point, the change has moved beyond project delivery and become embedded organisational capability.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Employees follow visible leadership more readily than organisational announcements.	Leaders are accountable for ensuring operational changes comply with governance requirements.
Frontline leaders have the greatest influence on day-to-day adoption.	Operational decisions should be supported by clearly defined authority and accountability.
Leadership behaviours establish the culture surrounding change.	Leaders should actively verify that approved controls remain effective during implementation.
Sponsorship requires continuous engagement rather than periodic endorsement.	Management oversight should balance delivery objectives with operational risk management.
Effective leaders coach people through uncertainty rather than simply directing them.	Escalation pathways should be understood before significant operational decisions are required.
Sustainable change occurs when leadership consistently reinforces new expectations and behaviours.	Strong operational leadership ensures that governance remains effective beyond project completion.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Deliver
Also Supports	Discover, Define, Design, Depart
Why it matters	Leadership alignment, sponsorship and visible commitment remain essential throughout every phase of change.

Preparation is where leadership becomes visible. Throughout my career, I've seen organisations invest heavily in training while overlooking communication, coaching and leadership. Training teaches people what to do. Leadership gives them confidence to do it.

I've come to believe that readiness is emotional as much as it is technical. People need to believe they can succeed before they genuinely commit to new ways of working. (Martin)

The most effective leaders I've worked with didn't simply sponsor change; they demonstrated it through their decisions. People quickly notice whether leaders continue to rely on old reports, bypass new governance, or request information outside agreed-upon processes. Those everyday decisions either strengthen or weaken the future operating model. From my perspective, leadership is less about promoting change and more about consistently modelling the behaviours, governance and decision-making standards expected throughout the organisation. (Peter)

Part Six - Working with the EAM Project

Chapter 18 - Integrating with the System Integrator

One of the most overlooked aspects of organisational change management in an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation is not the technology itself; it is the relationship between the organisation and the System Integrator (SI). Too often, the SI is engaged to deliver a system, while the business attempts to deliver organisational change, and the Project Management Office (PMO) focuses on schedule, budget and reporting. Each group is successful according to its own measures, yet the overall program struggles because nobody is accountable for integrating these perspectives.

Every enterprise transformation involves two changes.

The first is the permanent organisation's transition to EAM. The second is the temporary delivery organisation, which must continually evolve its own capability, structure and ways of working as the programme progresses.

When this second change is overlooked, resources become reactive, workstreams become siloed, and dependencies are managed too late.

Good Management of Change governs both: the organisation receiving the change and the programme delivering it. (Peter)

An SI is typically contracted to configure software, manage technical delivery and achieve contractual milestones. Organisational Change Management is focused on adoption, capability and business readiness. Operations are concerned with keeping the lights on while preparing for a new way of working. Unless these groups deliberately work as one integrated team, the implementation becomes a collection of parallel workstreams rather than a single transformation.

One of the first signs of a siloed project is the language used. The SI talks about configuration. The PMO talks about milestones. Business leaders talk about operational pressures. Change practitioners talk about readiness. Everyone is technically correct, yet they are often describing different versions of success.

Successful EAM programs deliberately blur these boundaries. Workshops are attended by consultants, business representatives and change practitioners together. Configuration decisions include discussions about training, communications, data impacts and business ownership. Design sessions become business transformation sessions rather than software demonstrations.

The SI should never be viewed as "them". Likewise, the business should not be treated as a client sitting outside the project waiting to receive a finished product. Everyone involved is collectively responsible for achieving business outcomes, not simply completing contractual deliverables.

The most successful implementations are characterised by shared accountability. Instead of asking whether the SI has delivered the configuration, the better question

becomes whether the organisation is genuinely ready to operate the new capability. Those are two very different measures of success.

Project governance

Governance is often mistaken for meetings, reports and approval processes. In reality, governance is about ensuring the right decisions are made by the right people at the right time.

In many EAM implementations, governance itself becomes fragmented. The Steering Committee reviews financial performance. The SI governs technical decisions. The PMO governs project delivery. Operations govern day-to-day business priorities. Organisational Change governs people impacts. Individually, these structures make sense. Collectively, they often create disconnected decision-making.

A common symptom is that project decisions are made without understanding their operational consequences. Configuration changes are approved because they fit the schedule, even though they introduce significant training impacts. Scope changes are accepted because they satisfy business requests without considering the effort required for data migration or the complexity of testing.

Good governance integrates perspectives rather than separating them.

Every significant decision should consider several dimensions simultaneously:

- Business value
- Operational impact
- Technical feasibility
- Change readiness
- Data implications
- Long-term supportability

This requires governance forums that include business leaders, technical leaders, change leaders and operational representatives; not simply project managers.

Another governance challenge occurs when authority remains unclear. Functional consultants sometimes make business decisions when no one from the business is available. Technical teams define future processes because governance cannot resolve competing opinions. Eventually, software begins driving the organisation rather than the organisation driving the software.

Effective governance keeps ownership where it belongs with the business while ensuring informed advice is available from every discipline.

Governance should integrate the project. It should never reinforce silos.

PMO

Project/Program/Portfolio Management Offices are exceptionally good at measuring delivery. They track schedules, budgets, risks, issues, actions and milestones with impressive discipline.

Unfortunately, those measurements can unintentionally create a false sense of progress.

A project can report green across every dashboard while organisational readiness remains dangerously red.

This happens because many PMOs report project performance rather than business preparedness.

Milestones such as design complete, configuration complete or testing complete are important. However, none of these automatically mean that people understand the new processes, that data owners have accepted accountability, or that frontline supervisors are prepared to lead the transition.

The PMO should serve as the integrator of delivery rather than simply a reporter of activities.

A mature PMO actively asks questions such as:

- Is the business actually ready?
- Are change activities keeping pace with technical delivery?
- Are data issues delaying adoption?
- Are operational leaders engaged?
- Have deployment risks been considered beyond technology?

When organisational change becomes part of the PMO reporting rhythm, executive conversations also change. Discussions move beyond "Are we on schedule?" towards "Will this actually succeed?"

The strongest PMOs understand that project success is measured at go-live, while transformation success is measured months and years afterwards.

Reporting should therefore connect technical progress with organisational capability rather than treating them as separate conversations.

Functional consultants

Functional consultants possess deep knowledge of how the EAM system can support business processes. They understand configuration options, workflows and industry practices.

However, functional consultants sometimes become accidental owners of business decisions.

When business representatives are unavailable or uncertain, consultants naturally step in to fill the gap. They recommend process designs based on previous implementations and software capability. While often well-intentioned, this can result in a solution that reflects industry averages rather than the organisation's unique operating model.

Organisational Change Management plays a critical role in preventing this.

The role of functional consultants is to explain possibilities.

The business's role is to determine what is appropriate.

The role of OCM is to ensure the organisation is capable of adopting those decisions.

Functional consultants also benefit enormously from exposure to real operational environments. Time spent in workshops is valuable, but time spent observing planners, maintainers, operators and supervisors provides context that cannot be captured in process diagrams.

When consultants understand how work is actually performed, not merely how it is documented, they produce solutions that are more practical, more usable and ultimately more likely to be adopted.

The best functional consultants see themselves as facilitators of organisational improvement rather than designers of software configuration.

Technical consultants

Technical consultants are responsible for integrations, security, infrastructure, custom development and technical architecture. Their work is often invisible to end users, yet absolutely critical to implementation success.

Because their work is highly specialised, technical teams can become isolated from the broader transformation.

Technical decisions frequently have significant organisational consequences.

Changing authentication methods affects user access.

Integration design influences business processes.

Mobile architecture affects field workers.

Security models shape delegation and accountability.

Performance issues influence user confidence.

If technical consultants operate independently, these impacts are often discovered late, sometimes during testing or even after deployment.

Successful projects deliberately connect technical consultants with business representatives and change practitioners.

Rather than asking only "Can this be built?", discussions also include:

- Who will use it?
- How will they learn it?
- What business behaviour changes?
- What operational risks exist?

Technology decisions should always consider human consequences.

The most successful technical consultants understand they are not simply delivering architecture; they are enabling people to work differently.

Business SMEs

Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) are often regarded as the voice of the business.

In reality, they are the voice of part of the business.

This distinction matters.

SMEs bring invaluable operational knowledge, but they also carry local practices, historical workarounds and personal preferences. If projects rely exclusively on SMEs without broader governance, local optimisation can become enterprise complexity.

An experienced maintenance planner may advocate for processes that work perfectly at one site but create inconsistency across the organisation.

OCM encourages projects to distinguish between expertise and representation.

- SMEs provide insight.
- Business leaders provide direction.
- Process owners provide consistency.
- Operations provide practicality.

When these perspectives are combined, decisions become stronger.

SMEs also need support. Many are expected to participate in workshops while continuing full-time operational roles. Fatigue, frustration and declining engagement are common outcomes.

Projects that value SMEs protect their time, recognise their contribution and ensure their knowledge is shared rather than concentrated in a handful of individuals.

SMEs are essential contributors, but they should never become isolated decision-makers.

Business Process Owner (BPO)

One of the clearest indicators of a mature EAM implementation is the presence of genuine Business Process Owners.

Unlike SMEs, Process Owners are accountable for how work is performed across the enterprise, not just within their local function.

Their accountability continues long after the project has finished.

Without clear Process Owners, consultants often make process decisions, project teams become process custodians, and operational consistency quickly disappears after go-live.

Business Process Owners provide continuity.

- They resolve competing operational priorities.
- They approve process standards.
- They balance local flexibility with enterprise consistency.
- They ensure improvements continue after implementation.

OCM works closely with Process Owners because they become visible leaders of change.

Employees are far more likely to adopt new ways of working when they know the process has been endorsed by someone accountable for operational performance rather than by the project team.

Process ownership transforms a project deliverable into an enduring business capability.

Avoiding siloed delivery

Perhaps the greatest threat to EAM implementations is not poor technology or poor planning; it is siloed delivery.

Every workstream believes it is succeeding.

- The SI completes configuration.
- The PMO reports milestones.
- The data team migrates records.
- Testing executes scripts.
- Training delivers courses.
- Communications distribute updates.
- Deployment prepares cutover.

Yet the organisation still struggles. Why?

Because none of these activities automatically connect to each other.

Transformation occurs between the workstreams, not inside them.

Avoiding silos requires deliberate integration.

- Cross-functional planning sessions should replace isolated status meetings.
- Business readiness should appear alongside technical readiness.
- Risks should be owned collectively rather than assigned to individual workstreams.

Success should be measured by business outcomes rather than completed tasks.

One integrated delivery team will consistently outperform multiple high-performing siloed teams.

People adopt integrated solutions, not isolated deliverables.

Data Teams

Data teams often work quietly in the background, cleansing, mapping, validating and migrating information.

Despite this, data is one of the most visible aspects of go-live.

Users judge the new EAM system almost immediately by whether they can find assets, locate spare parts, trust maintenance history or generate meaningful reports.

When data teams operate separately from the business, migration becomes a technical exercise instead of an operational one.

Business users frequently assume "the project is handling the data."

Data teams assume "the business owns the data."

The result is predictable.

Nobody truly owns data quality.

Successful projects embed operational representatives within data activities.

- Asset owners validate hierarchies.
- Maintenance teams verify equipment information.
- Stores personnel review inventory.
- Finance confirms coding structures.
- Engineering validates technical attributes.
- Data quality becomes everyone's responsibility.

The best data teams are not simply migration specialists. They are custodians of organisational trust.

Testing Team

Testing is frequently viewed as the final technical quality gate before deployment.

From an OCM perspective, testing is also one of the earliest opportunities for organisational learning.

Unfortunately, testing teams often become isolated from operations.

Dedicated testers execute scripts successfully while future users remain largely uninvolved.

- The project declares testing complete.
- The business experiences the system for the first time at go-live.
- Effective testing is collaborative.
- Business users participate.
- Supervisors validate scenarios.
- Process Owners confirm end-to-end workflows.
- Change practitioners observe where users struggle.
- Training teams identify knowledge gaps.

Testing therefore becomes more than software validation. It becomes organisational rehearsal.

Every defect discovered in testing is valuable.

Every misunderstanding identified during User Acceptance Testing is equally valuable because it reveals capability gaps before deployment.

Testing should build confidence, not simply confirm functionality.

Deployment Team

Deployment is often portrayed as a carefully orchestrated weekend of technical activities.

- Servers are activated.
- Data is migrated.
- Interfaces are switched on.
- Users receive access.

From an organisational perspective, deployment is much bigger than cutover.

Deployment represents the moment an organisation begins operating differently.

If deployment teams work independently of change, communications, and operations, technical success can quickly become an operational failure.

Successful deployment planning includes:

- Leadership visibility
- Hypercare planning
- Business support arrangements
- Floor walkers
- Decision escalation pathways
- User support
- Communications
- Operational contingency planning

Deployment teams should work alongside business leaders rather than simply handing over the system once technical tasks are complete.

Go-live is not the finish line for the project. It is the starting line for the organisation.

The most successful deployment teams understand that their role is not simply to implement software; it is to help people confidently begin a new way of working together.

Solution Architects

Solution Architects occupy one of the most influential positions in an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation, yet they often operate behind the scenes. They are responsible for ensuring the overall solution fits together; applications, integrations, data, security, infrastructure and business processes all need to work as a coherent whole. In many projects, however, the Solution Architect becomes another specialist operating within their own technical silo, disconnected from the business's operational reality.

A good Solution Architect does much more than design technology. They translate business strategy into an integrated solution that can be implemented, supported and evolved over time. Every architectural decision should balance competing priorities: business value, technical complexity, operational practicality, security, performance and long-term maintainability.

The challenge is that architecture discussions can easily become dominated by technology. Meetings focus on interfaces, cloud services, APIs, environments, and infrastructure, while the conversation about how maintenance planners, supervisors, operators, and field technicians will actually experience the solution fades into the background.

This is where Organisational Change Management provides an important counterbalance.

Architecture decisions influence how people work every day.

- A decision to integrate with one system instead of another changes business processes.
- A security model determines who can approve work.
- A mobile architecture affects field productivity.
- A reporting architecture influences decision-making.
- A master data architecture shapes accountability across the organisation.

These are not simply technical decisions; they are organisational decisions with technical consequences.

One of the recurring risks in large programs is that Solution Architects become the primary integrators of technology, while no one is responsible for integrating the people, process, and governance dimensions. The SI may produce an elegant technical architecture, but if business process owners, change practitioners, trainers and operational leaders are not involved in key architectural discussions, the resulting solution may be technically sound yet operationally difficult to adopt.

The strongest Solution Architects actively seek perspectives beyond the technical team. They involve Business Process Owners when evaluating design options. They engage data teams to understand the implications of information. They work with change practitioners to appreciate adoption risks. They include deployment teams to ensure operational readiness and collaborate with testing teams to validate end-to-end business scenarios rather than isolated technical functions.

Perhaps most importantly, Solution Architects help prevent siloed delivery by continually asking a simple question: How does this decision affect the whole organisation? Instead of optimising individual components, they optimise the complete business capability.

The most successful Solution Architects recognise that their role is not to design the best technology. Their role is to design the best business solution, one where systems, data, processes, governance and people work together seamlessly. In an EAM transformation, that holistic perspective is often the difference between implementing software and delivering lasting organisational change.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations

A System Integrator delivers technology, but the business owns the change.	System configuration should align with approved operational governance rather than consultant preference.
Collaboration among business, project, and SI teams delivers better outcomes than contractual relationships alone.	Design decisions should be formally reviewed for operational, safety and compliance impacts.
Business SMEs should actively shape the solution rather than validate it.	Technical changes should remain traceable through approved configuration management processes.
Solution Architects bridge business needs with technical capability and should remain connected to operational reality.	Every design decision should have a clearly identified owner and approval pathway.
Avoiding siloed delivery requires continuous communication across functional, technical and business teams.	Interfaces between systems should be assessed for operational risk before deployment.
Successful implementations occur when everyone shares responsibility for business outcomes, not just project milestones.	Governance should ensure that implementation decisions strengthen long-term operational capability rather than short-term project delivery.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Design
Also Supports	Deliver
Why it matters	Collaborative governance between business, project and implementation partners reduces delivery risk.

The best implementation partners I've worked alongside understood they weren't just delivering software; they were helping shape an organisation's future capability. Successful relationships develop when responsibilities are clear, governance is respected, and difficult conversations occur early. I've found organisations achieve better outcomes when they remain active owners of business decisions rather than assuming the system integrator owns the solution. Technology expertise is essential, but organisational accountability should never be outsourced. After all, the SI will have limited access to the organisation as a whole during the transformation. (Peter)

Chapter 19 - Working with Business Analysts

One of the greatest misconceptions in enterprise transformation is that Business Analysts (BAs) document what the business already knows. In reality, an effective Business Analyst helps the organisation discover how it actually operates, why it operates that way, and whether those ways of working remain fit for purpose. Within Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementations, this distinction is critical. Too many projects begin with assumptions about maintenance practices, approval

processes or operational workflows that have never been validated. Those assumptions quickly become system designs that embed today's inefficiencies into tomorrow's technology.

A common request is: “You are busy; just send us whatever process artefacts you have, and we will take it from there.”

That approach is flawed. Process documentation is an information asset, but it is often under-maintained because operational resources are prioritised toward keeping the organisation running.

Outdated artefacts do not necessarily mean poor processes. They may reflect capable practices that have evolved beyond the documentation.

Delivery teams that judge the organisation too quickly risk designing future processes without understanding the full operational context. The task is not to replace what appears imperfect, but to determine what is effective, what is outdated and what must be controlled differently in the future state. (Peter)

Organisational Change Management (OCM) has a close relationship with Business Analysis because both disciplines seek to understand people, work, and decision-making before attempting to redesign them. The BA analyses the business; the change practitioner analyses the organisation's readiness and ability to adopt change. Together, they ensure that technology supports business capability rather than simply automating existing habits.

The most valuable Business Analysts spend far more time asking "why?" than "what?". They observe fieldwork, interview operators, planners, and supervisors, compare documented processes with actual practice, and identify where informal workarounds have become accepted ways of working. They recognise that process maps rarely tell the whole story. Whiteboards, spreadsheets, radio conversations, tribal knowledge and local practices often explain more about how work is completed than any documented procedure.

An experienced BA also understands that they are not the decision maker. Their role is to facilitate understanding, challenge assumptions with evidence, identify impacts across the organisation and ensure decisions are owned by the business rather than delegated to consultants or software vendors. Good analysis creates clarity. Great analysis creates confidence that the organisation is solving the right problem.

Requirements

Requirements are often treated as a shopping list of system functionality. In reality, they are statements describing what the business needs to achieve its objectives. There is a significant difference between "the system must have a button that..." and "the business needs to ensure critical assets are inspected within regulatory timeframes."

In EAM projects, poor requirements often stem from existing frustrations with legacy systems. Users naturally describe the features they wish they had instead of the outcomes they need. This leads to solutions that replicate old thinking in new software.

Even in transformations where the eventual system is known, all business requirements require an element of agnostic language. Mentions of eventual systems should be added only as value statements to enhance understanding of the requirement. Ie. adds value to the requirement, not in place of a business requirement (Peter).

Good Business Analysts continually distinguish between business requirements and solution requirements. Business requirements describe the capability the organisation needs. Functional requirements describe how the software may support that capability. Non-functional requirements describe qualities such as performance, security, usability and availability.

OCM adds another dimension by asking whether the requirement changes people's roles, behaviours, decision-making or organisational capability. Every requirement has a people impact that deserves equal consideration alongside the technical implementation.

Strong requirements are evidence-based, measurable, testable and owned by the business. They should survive changes in software products because they describe business needs rather than software features.

Specifications

Specifications translate agreed requirements into sufficient detail for designers, developers, configurators and testers. However, specifications should never become the substitute for understanding the business.

Many implementation failures occur because specifications become increasingly detailed while becoming progressively disconnected from operational reality. A beautifully written specification describing the wrong process is still wrong.

Good specifications explain what is to be delivered, why it matters, the assumptions made, dependencies, business rules, data requirements, interfaces, exceptions and expected outcomes. They provide enough precision to remove ambiguity without becoming unnecessarily prescriptive.

From an OCM perspective, specifications should also document organisational impacts. New responsibilities, changed approvals, revised reporting relationships and altered ways of working deserve the same level of attention as screen layouts or workflow configuration.

Specifications are living documents that evolve as understanding improves. Treating them as contracts rather than learning tools often discourages valuable discovery throughout the project.

Process design

Process design is not an exercise in drawing attractive flowcharts. It is about deliberately designing how work should flow through the organisation to achieve better business outcomes.

Many organisations unknowingly automate historical processes that were designed around old technology, outdated policies or organisational structures that no longer exist. A new EAM implementation provides an opportunity to redesign work rather than digitise it.

Effective process design begins by understanding how work is actually performed. Field observations often reveal numerous informal decisions, local workarounds and practical adaptations that never appear on official process maps. Some of these practices should be eliminated, while others represent valuable operational knowledge that deserves formal recognition.

OCM encourages process design that considers both efficiency and adoption. A technically perfect process that people cannot realistically follow will quickly be replaced by unofficial alternatives.

Good process design also defines ownership, inputs, outputs, decision points, exceptions, handovers and measures of success. It balances governance with operational practicality, recognising that the best process is one that consistently delivers value while remaining usable by the people expected to follow it.

Business rules

Business rules define the logic that governs how an organisation operates. They determine what is permitted, required or prohibited irrespective of the technology being used.

Examples within EAM include who can approve maintenance work, when assets require inspection, how criticality influences planning priorities, or what conditions trigger regulatory reporting.

One common mistake is allowing software limitations to define business rules. Instead, organisations should first determine the rule that best supports governance, compliance and operational performance before configuring the software accordingly.

Business Analysts play an important role in identifying hidden business rules that exist only in people's experience. Many organisations rely on long-serving employees who instinctively know exceptions, shortcuts and unwritten policies that have never been formally documented.

OCM helps determine whether existing rules remain appropriate. Every business rule influences behaviour. If the rule encourages undesirable behaviour or unnecessary complexity, implementing it within the new system institutionalises the problem.

Business rules should therefore be explicit, understandable, consistently applied and owned by the business, not by the software.

Decision ownership

One of the most overlooked aspects of system implementation is determining who owns decisions. Technology can automate workflows, but it should never obscure accountability.

Business Analysts frequently discover decisions that are assumed rather than assigned. Maintenance priorities, asset classifications, equipment criticality, budget approvals and work acceptance may all involve multiple stakeholders with unclear ownership.

The role of the BA is not to make these decisions but to expose ambiguity and facilitate agreement. When decision ownership remains unclear, projects often experience endless design changes because different stakeholders believe they hold authority.

From an OCM perspective, decision ownership is central to successful adoption. People need confidence about where authority begins and ends. New systems often redistribute decision-making by providing greater visibility, stronger governance or automated approvals. Unless these changes are deliberately managed, confusion and resistance inevitably follow.

Clear decision ownership improves governance, reduces delays and ensures accountability remains with the business rather than the implementation team.

User stories

User stories have become a popular way to capture requirements, particularly in Agile delivery. At their best, they focus on the value being delivered rather than the functionality being built.

A typical user story describes who needs something, what they need and why they need it. The emphasis is on enabling business outcomes rather than on describing software features.

However, user stories should not replace genuine business analysis. Simply asking users what they want often results in requests that optimise individual tasks rather than organisational performance. Good Business Analysts probe deeper, exploring the underlying business problem before documenting the story.

Within EAM projects, stories should reflect the diverse needs of planners, schedulers, operators, maintainers, reliability engineers, contractors, supervisors and executives. Different users experience different aspects of the same business process.

OCM ensures user stories also consider adoption. A story should describe how people will work differently, what support they require and how success will be measured after implementation, not merely how a screen should function.

Acceptance criteria

Acceptance criteria define the conditions that must be satisfied before a requirement or user story is considered complete. They provide clarity for developers, testers and business stakeholders alike.

Good acceptance criteria eliminate ambiguity by describing observable, measurable outcomes. Rather than saying "the system should work correctly," they define exactly what constitutes successful behaviour under normal and exceptional circumstances.

From an organisational perspective, acceptance should extend beyond technical functionality. A process may technically operate as designed while still confusing users, increasing workload or creating unnecessary delays.

OCM encourages broader acceptance measures that include usability, operational readiness, training effectiveness and business confidence. Successful implementation means users can perform their work efficiently, understand new responsibilities and trust the information produced by the system.

Ultimately, the business, not the project team, accepts the solution. Acceptance criteria should therefore reflect business success, not simply successful software configuration.

Use Cases

Use cases describe how users interact with a system to accomplish specific business objectives. Unlike isolated functional requirements, they place technology within the broader context of business activities.

An effective use case captures the trigger, the actors involved, the normal sequence of events, alternative paths, exceptions, and expected outcomes. This helps reveal dependencies that individual requirements often overlook.

For EAM implementations, use cases might describe creating emergency work orders, commissioning new assets, performing preventive maintenance, approving shutdown activities or managing contractor work. Each use case exposes interactions between people, processes, data and technology.

Business Analysts should validate use cases through observation rather than assumption. The way a planner believes work orders are created may differ significantly from how operators actually initiate work. Similarly, documented procedures often fail to capture informal communication, local knowledge and operational judgement that influence real-world execution.

From an OCM perspective, use cases become valuable tools for stakeholder engagement, training, testing and readiness assessments because they represent realistic scenarios that users recognise. They help bridge the gap between system design and everyday work, ensuring the implemented solution reflects how the organisation intends to operate, not merely how someone assumed it worked.

As part of a mature transformation, all business objects (People, Process, Technology, Data) should be mapped into a modelling tool, with many stereotypes to manage all types of objects; think of it as a living Zachman model for the organisation. By modelling the Change and the organisation, at the very least, the function and the capability to deliver will be evident (Peter).

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Business Analysts should discover how the organisation works, not simply document what they are told.	Business requirements should preserve essential operational controls and governance obligations.

Requirements gathering is a collaborative exercise rather than a documentation activity.	Business rules should clearly define operational decision-making responsibilities.
Process design should challenge unnecessary complexity rather than replicate it.	Changes to approved business processes should follow established governance procedures.
Acceptance criteria should reflect operational success, not just technical completion.	Use cases should demonstrate that new processes remain safe, compliant and practical.
Business ownership is established through participation, not project sign-off.	Requirements should be traceable from business need through implementation and operational approval.
The best analysts build relationships that encourage open discussion about improvement opportunities.	Operational stakeholders should validate that proposed requirements support real-world operational needs.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Design
Also Supports	Discover, Define
Why it matters	Effective business analysis transforms organisational understanding into practical solution requirements.

Some of the best Business Analysts I've worked with spent more time asking "why" than documenting "what". Good analysis isn't measured by the number of requirements captured. It's measured by how well those requirements support future operational capability. Business Analysts play an important role in challenging assumptions, exposing operational risks and ensuring that proposed solutions genuinely improve the organisation rather than simply reproducing existing practices in a new system.

When a good business analyst captures requirements, they take a helicopter view of the context before delving into the details. They document the context of attributes, including governance, a business glossary, decision-making, dependencies, and duplication across functions. This is when business modelling can be far more useful than an isolated document of value-stream, function, process or workflow (Peter)

Chapter 20 - Solution Design

Solution design is often treated as a technical activity led by architects, consultants and software vendors. Organisational Change Management (OCM) reminds us that solution design is equally a people activity. Every design decision changes how people work, who makes decisions, how information flows and what behaviours are encouraged. A technically elegant solution that the business does not understand, trust or support will rarely deliver its intended value.

Too often the SI speaks of the system and solution as software, whereas the pure EAM-perspective definition of a system is the management system, taking into consideration everything inside the software and all the bits and pieces required to do it, and the solution is all of it interrelated. People, Process, Technology, Information, Data (Peter)

One of the most successful EAM implementations I was involved in built the Integrated Management System (IMS) in parallel with the project. This ensured that the business processes and system processes were integrated and measured effectively. It also held everyone to account for the outcome, NOT just the activity. (Martin)

One of the biggest mistakes in Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementations is designing the system around software capabilities rather than organisational capabilities. Workshops quickly become discussions about screens, fields, and configuration settings rather than conversations about maintenance strategy, operational accountability, decision-making, and business outcomes.

Effective solution design begins with understanding what success looks like for the organisation. The software should enable better asset management practices rather than automate existing habits. This requires business leaders, maintenance planners, supervisors, field technicians, warehouse staff, engineers and operational managers to actively participate in shaping the future solution.

OCM encourages collaborative design rather than design by demonstration. Rather than asking users whether they like a particular screen, change practitioners facilitate conversations about how work will be performed, what information is required to make decisions, what exceptions occur in practice, and where current frustrations lie. These discussions create ownership because people recognise their experience has influenced the future state.

Good solution design also balances standardisation with practicality. Every organisation has local practices developed over many years. Some represent valuable operational knowledge while others are simply historical workarounds. The design process should challenge existing practices without dismissing them. The objective is not to preserve every local variation, nor force unnecessary standardisation, but to consciously determine which ways of working create the greatest organisational value.

Ultimately, solution design is successful when the business can recognise itself in the future operating model. The technology becomes an enabler of improved asset management rather than something imposed upon the organisation.

Configuration versus customisation

Few topics generate more debate during an EAM implementation than whether to configure the system or customise it. Technology teams often discuss this as a software engineering decision. OCM views it through a different lens: what impact will the decision have on adoption, ownership and long-term organisational capability?

Configuration uses the capabilities already built into the software, allowing the organisation to adapt the system without changing the underlying application.

Customisation modifies the software itself, often creating unique functionality tailored to a single organisation.

Many businesses initially favour customisation because they want the new system to replicate their current processes. The familiar argument is, "We've always done it this way." However, this often ignores an important question: is the current way actually the best way?

One of the responsibilities of change practitioners is helping the organisation distinguish between genuine business requirements and organisational preferences. Some existing processes are driven by regulatory obligations, safety requirements or operational realities. Others exist because the previous system could not support a better approach.

Every customisation increases implementation complexity, testing effort, upgrade costs and future support requirements. More importantly, it can reinforce outdated behaviours rather than encourage improved asset management practices. Users may become comfortable because the system looks familiar, but the organisation misses the opportunity to modernise how work is managed.

Conversely, blindly adopting standard software without considering operational reality can also damage trust. If configuration forces impractical work practices, users quickly develop workarounds outside the system.

OCM therefore encourages informed decision-making. The business should understand the long-term consequences of every customisation request and participate in determining whether changing the organisation may provide greater value than changing the software. Sustainable change often comes from adapting business practices rather than endlessly adapting technology.

System Process vs System Workflow

Many organisations use the terms process' and 'workflow' interchangeably, but they are not the same. Understanding the difference is essential for successful organisational change.

A business process describes how work is intended to flow across the organisation. It includes decision-making, governance, responsibilities, and business outcomes. A workflow within an EAM system automates portions of that process through approvals, notifications, status changes and system actions.

Problems occur when organisations assume the workflow is the process.

An approval workflow may move a work order through five system statuses, but it cannot explain why decisions are made, how supervisors prioritise competing work, when exceptions should occur or how operational judgement influences outcomes. Those behaviours remain organisational responsibilities.

OCM focuses on ensuring people understand both the business process and the supporting workflow. Employees need to know not only which button to press, but why the workflow exists, what business outcome it supports and how it contributes to improved asset management performance.

Another common challenge is attempting to automate poor processes. A complicated manual approval chain often becomes an equally complicated electronic workflow. The technology faithfully reproduces inefficiency rather than eliminating it.

During design workshops, practitioners should continually ask whether a workflow reflects how work should happen or merely how work currently happens. Simplifying governance before automating it frequently produces better business outcomes than simply digitising complexity.

The most successful implementations recognise that the system workflow is a tool supporting the broader business process. The technology facilitates good practice, but people remain responsible for judgement, collaboration, and operational decision-making.

Business ownership

One of the greatest predictors of implementation success is clear business ownership. Too many EAM projects become viewed as IT initiatives because the software is technically implemented by technology teams. Yet the people whose work changes belong to the business.

OCM continually reinforces that ownership cannot be delegated to the project team. While consultants configure systems and project managers coordinate delivery, only business leaders can define how the organisation wants to operate in the future.

Business ownership begins with visible sponsorship but extends much further. Leaders must participate in design decisions, resolve competing priorities, communicate expectations, model desired behaviours and accept accountability for adoption after go-live.

Operational managers also play a critical role. Their teams watch what they do far more closely than what they say. If supervisors continue using spreadsheets, bypassing workflows, or ignoring data quality, employees quickly conclude that the new system is optional.

Ownership also means making difficult decisions. Every implementation involves trade-offs between standardisation and flexibility, operational convenience and governance, local preferences and enterprise consistency. These decisions cannot be left solely to vendors or technical specialists.

OCM helps establish governance structures in which business representatives genuinely own future processes, business rules, and operational outcomes. This includes assigning clear process owners rather than simply identifying system administrators.

The ultimate measure of ownership comes after the project has finished. If the business continues to improve processes, monitor adoption, and refine practices without relying on consultants, ownership has successfully transferred. When the project team leaves, the organisation, not the software vendor, must own the future.

Operational practicality

Solutions often look impressive inside meeting rooms yet prove frustrating in workshops, maintenance depots or field environments. Operational practicality ensures the designed solution works where real work actually happens.

OCM encourages designers to spend time observing operations rather than relying solely on documented procedures. The realities of remote sites, shift work, emergency maintenance, poor connectivity, safety constraints and competing priorities frequently reveal challenges that never appear in process maps.

Field technicians, planners, operators, and supervisors possess practical knowledge that cannot be captured solely through documentation. They understand the shortcuts that exist, the reasons work is delayed, the genuinely useful information and the situations where procedures must adapt to reality.

Ignoring this experience often produces systems that appear compliant but are difficult to use. Employees respond by developing unofficial workarounds, delaying data entry or maintaining parallel records outside the EAM.

Operational practicality does not mean accepting every existing practice without question. Rather, it means balancing governance with usability. Good design should support operational efficiency while still improving data quality, consistency, and decision-making.

Pilots, simulations and field testing are invaluable tools. Watching users complete genuine work using realistic scenarios often identifies issues that months of workshop discussions fail to uncover.

Ultimately, people adopt systems that help them perform their jobs more effectively. If the solution respects operational realities while supporting better asset management practices, acceptance becomes far easier and sustainable change more likely.

Human-centred design

Human-centred design recognises that successful EAM implementations are not built around software; they are built around the people who use it every day.

Historically, many implementations have focused on technical capability, assuming users would adapt once the system was deployed. OCM challenges this assumption by asking how different groups experience the change, what motivates them and what barriers prevent successful adoption.

Different roles interact with the EAM in different ways. A planner requires powerful scheduling capabilities; a technician needs rapid access to field work instructions; a warehouse employee focuses on inventory accuracy; and executives require meaningful reporting. Designing every interface or process for a generic "user" inevitably leaves nobody satisfied.

Human-centred design also considers cognitive workload. Complex forms, unnecessary approvals, duplicated data entry and confusing terminology increase

frustration and reduce adoption. Simplicity is not merely good user experience; it also improves compliance, data quality, and productivity.

The approach extends beyond software interfaces. Training, communications, leadership behaviours, performance measures and support models should all be designed around the needs of the people experiencing the change.

Co-design workshops, usability testing and iterative feedback sessions provide valuable opportunities for employees to shape the future solution. When users recognise their input reflected in the final design, they become advocates rather than critics.

The objective is not simply making the software easier to use. It is creating an environment where people understand the purpose of the change, have confidence in the new ways of working and believe the organisation has designed the solution with them rather than for them.

Bespoke vs COTS

The decision between developing a bespoke solution or implementing a Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) application is often framed as a technology choice. From an OCM perspective, it is equally a decision about organisational change.

A bespoke system can closely reflect existing business practices because it is built specifically for the organisation. This can reduce immediate disruption but may also preserve outdated processes, inconsistent governance and historical inefficiencies. The organisation changes very little because the software changes to match it.

A COTS EAM platform takes a different approach. It embodies years of industry experience and established asset management practices. Implementing it often requires the organisation to adapt its processes, governance and behaviours to align with proven ways of working.

This creates one of the biggest cultural challenges in transformation projects. People may interpret standardisation as a loss of flexibility or local autonomy. OCM helps reposition the conversation by focusing on the benefits of consistency, improved data quality, easier collaboration and lower long-term support costs.

Neither approach is universally correct. Highly specialised industries may have legitimate requirements that cannot be met through standard software. However, organisations should resist the temptation to assume uniqueness simply because current practices differ from industry norms.

The key question is not whether the software can be made to fit the business. The better question is whether changing the business will improve organisational performance.

Successful organisations view COTS implementations as opportunities to mature their operating model rather than merely install new technology. When people understand they are adopting better ways to manage assets, not simply replacing software, the conversation shifts from protecting the past to building the future.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Solution design should enable better business practices rather than replicate outdated ones.	Configuration decisions should preserve operational integrity throughout the asset lifecycle.
Human-centred design improves adoption by reducing unnecessary complexity.	Customisations should only be approved where operational value clearly outweighs long-term risk.
The business should own the future process while technology enables it.	Workflow approvals should align with organisational governance and delegated authority.
Configuring software is easier than changing organisational behaviours.	Every design decision should be evaluated for its operational consequences.
Good design balances efficiency with usability for frontline workers.	Operational practicality should take precedence over technical elegance.
Future-state workshops should encourage challenge rather than confirm existing assumptions.	Design reviews should include operational representatives before configuration is approved.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Design
Also Supports	Deliver
Why it matters	Well-designed solutions balance software capability with operational practicality and adoption.

Every design decision has an operational consequence. Functionality and technical capability matter, but each design choice also affects how work is performed, decisions are made, and risk is managed.

The strongest designs balance technical capability with operational practicality. They strengthen governance, clarify accountability and simplify decision-making rather than adding unnecessary complexity.

This becomes increasingly important as AI agents are introduced to perform tasks or make decisions on behalf of people. Their deployment must remain governed, traceable and subject to clear human accountability.

Good design is not judged by what the system can do, but by how safely and confidently the organisation can operate because of it. (Peter)

Chapter 21 – Testing

Testing is often viewed as a project activity that occurs near the end of an implementation. The system is configured, the technical team verifies it works, and

then the business is invited to "test it." This mindset is one of the biggest reasons Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementations struggle after go-live.

From an Organisational Change Management perspective, testing is not simply about finding software defects. It is about proving that the organisation is ready to operate differently. Every testing activity is an opportunity for people to understand future processes, validate new ways of working and gain confidence before the system becomes their daily reality.

Business users should never arrive at User Acceptance Testing (UAT) asking, "What am I supposed to test?" They should understand why testing exists, what successful business outcomes look like and how their observations influence the final solution. When OCM is ineffective, testing becomes a compliance exercise where users click through scripts with little understanding of the business consequences.

Testing should progressively answer a series of questions.

- Does the system technically work?
- Does the process work?
- Does the business want to work this way?
- Can people perform their roles?
- Can operations continue safely and efficiently?
- Is the organisation confident enough to go live?

Testing therefore becomes one of the most powerful change activities in the entire project. It exposes misunderstandings, reveals hidden operational practices, identifies capability gaps and provides valuable learning long before production deployment. Organisations that treat testing as organisational readiness rather than software validation almost always experience smoother implementations.

Business participation

Technology teams can test software. Only the business can test the business.

One of the most common mistakes made during EAM implementations is assuming that subject matter experts alone represent the entire organisation. While SMEs provide valuable knowledge, they often work closely with the project for months or years, gradually becoming experts in the new solution. Their experience no longer reflects the majority of operational users.

Meaningful business participation requires involvement from people who actually perform the work every day. Maintenance planners, supervisors, warehouse staff, operators, contractors and reliability engineers all experience the system differently. Each group brings operational knowledge that no project document can fully capture.

Organisational Change Management helps identify who should participate, why they should participate and what their role is throughout testing. Participants should understand they are not simply validating software; they are validating whether the future operating model is practical.

Broad business participation also builds ownership. People are far more likely to trust a solution they helped shape than one delivered by an external project team. They become advocates who explain the new processes to colleagues and help reduce resistance during deployment.

Testing should therefore become one of the largest engagement activities within the project rather than a final technical milestone.

Scenario testing

Real work rarely follows a perfectly documented process.

Business processes often describe the ideal path through a workflow, but operations constantly encounter exceptions. Equipment breaks unexpectedly, permits are delayed, spare parts are unavailable, contractors fail to arrive, priorities change, and emergency work interrupts planned schedules.

Scenario testing ensures that the EAM solution supports both routine work and operational reality.

Rather than simply confirming that "Create Work Order" functions correctly, business users should test realistic scenarios such as:

- Emergency breakdowns during night shift.
- Multiple equipment failures.
- Missing inventory.
- Contractor management.
- Regulatory inspections.
- Deferred maintenance.
- Planned shutdowns.
- Asset replacement.
- Mobile work in remote locations.

These scenarios encourage users to think operationally rather than procedurally. They often reveal missing business rules, unclear responsibilities and process gaps that conventional script-based testing never uncovers.

OCM encourages people to ask, "Could I actually do my job this way?" rather than simply, "Did the screen work?"

Operational testing

Operational testing shifts the conversation from software functionality to operational capability.

An EAM system may perform exactly as designed, yet still be unsuitable for day-to-day operations if it introduces unnecessary complexity or fails to accommodate real working conditions.

Operational testing considers questions such as:

- Can crews complete work efficiently?
- Does mobile access work in poor connectivity areas?

- Are maintenance planners receiving the right information?
- Can supervisors manage daily priorities?
- Are stores processes practical?
- Does the workflow align with shift operations?

This form of testing frequently uncovers practical issues that technical consultants cannot anticipate due to their lack of operational experience.

OCM encourages operational staff to evaluate not only whether the system functions but whether the organisation can continue to deliver safe, reliable and efficient asset management using the new processes

User Acceptance Testing

Many organisations misunderstand User Acceptance Testing.

It is not the business's responsibility to sign a document stating that the project can be completed.

User Acceptance Testing is the business formally accepting responsibility for operating within the future solution.

Successful UAT requires preparation long before the first test script is executed. Participants need to understand:

- The future business processes.
- Their changed responsibilities.
- The expected outcomes.
- How to record issues.
- What constitutes a defect.
- What falls outside project scope.

Without this preparation, users often focus on personal preferences rather than business requirements. Comments such as "I don't like this screen" or "The old system was easier" provide little value unless linked to genuine operational impacts.

Effective OCM prepares users to think like business owners rather than software reviewers. Their role is to determine whether the future operating model enables the organisation to achieve its objectives.

Business readiness

Testing is one of the strongest indicators of business readiness.

A technically complete system does not automatically mean the organisation is prepared for go-live. During testing, leaders can observe whether users understand new processes, whether decisions are being made correctly and whether people demonstrate confidence using the system.

Business readiness extends far beyond completed training records.

It considers whether people:

- Understand why changes are occurring.
- Can complete their work independently.
- Know where to obtain support.
- Trust the new processes.
- Accept new responsibilities.
- Demonstrate confidence operating within the EAM environment.

Testing provides objective evidence of these capabilities.

OCM practitioners should view testing outcomes alongside readiness assessments, stakeholder feedback, training effectiveness, and leadership observations to determine whether the organisation, not just the software, is genuinely ready for deployment. (Martin)

Learning during testing

Testing is one of the most effective learning environments available during an implementation.

Unlike classroom training, testing places people inside realistic situations where they apply knowledge, solve problems and experience the consequences of business decisions.

Many users leave testing with a far deeper understanding of the new system than they gained during formal training sessions.

Rather than discouraging questions during testing, projects should actively encourage discussion. Every question reveals an opportunity to improve documentation, clarify business rules or strengthen future training materials.

OCM practitioners should treat testing feedback as a valuable learning dataset rather than simply a list of issues. Patterns often emerge that highlight confusing processes, unclear terminology or capability gaps that require further support before go-live.

Testing therefore becomes both a validation exercise and a large-scale organisational learning event.

Continuous Improvement

Testing should not aim to produce perfection.

No implementation will eliminate every issue before deployment. The objective is to ensure that the organisation can safely and effectively operate while establishing mechanisms for continual improvement.

Business participants should understand that implementation is the beginning of an ongoing evolution rather than the final destination.

Testing frequently identifies:

- Process improvements.
- Better reporting.
- Simplified workflows.

- Additional automation opportunities.
- Improved training materials.
- Future enhancement ideas.

Capturing these observations creates a roadmap for post-go-live optimisation rather than allowing valuable ideas to disappear after project closure.

Organisations that embrace continuous improvement view testing as the first step in operational excellence rather than the final project checkpoint.

Defects vs Enhancement

One of the most misunderstood aspects of testing is distinguishing between defects and enhancements.

A defect occurs when the configured solution fails to meet agreed requirements, produces incorrect results or prevents users from completing required business processes.

An enhancement is different. It represents an idea that may improve usability, efficiency or user satisfaction but was never part of the agreed scope.

Without clear guidance, business users often report personal preferences as software defects. This creates unnecessary tension between the project team and the business, delaying the resolution of genuine issues.

Organisational Change Management plays an important role in helping participants understand this distinction before testing begins. Users should be encouraged to raise every observation while also recognising that not every suggestion requires immediate implementation.

Clear governance allows the project team to categorise feedback appropriately:

Defect: The solution does not meet agreed business requirements and must be corrected.

Enhancement: A valuable improvement that should be evaluated against business priorities, cost and future roadmap.

Training issue: The system works correctly, but additional learning or clearer documentation is required.

Business process issue: The challenge lies in the agreed way of working rather than the software itself.

When organisations understand these differences, testing becomes far more productive. Discussions remain focused on delivering a stable, usable solution while capturing valuable ideas that support continuous improvement long after the EAM implementation goes live.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations

Testing is one of the organisation's first opportunities to experience the future way of working.	Test scenarios should verify that operational controls remain effective.
Business participation in testing builds confidence and capability.	Operational acceptance should include validation of safety, compliance and governance requirements.
Defects often reveal process or training issues as much as software problems.	Testing should confirm that approved business rules operate as intended.
User Acceptance Testing is a business activity supported by technology teams.	Every critical operational process should be tested before approval for deployment.
Lessons learned during testing should improve both the solution and organisational readiness.	Defects affecting operational integrity should be prioritised above cosmetic enhancements.
Successful testing prepares people for go-live rather than simply validating software functionality.	Formal approval should only occur when operational stakeholders are satisfied that risks have been appropriately managed.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Deliver
Also Supports	Design
Why it matters	Testing validates both technical capability and organisational readiness before deployment.

Delivery is where organisations discover whether they are genuinely involved in the business or merely consulting it. I've always believed testing is one of the most powerful change activities because it gives people the opportunity to experience the future before they are expected to live it.

Some of my best conversations with operational teams have happened during testing. That's where uncertainty becomes confidence and where projects often discover opportunities they hadn't previously considered. (Martin)

Early in my career, I thought testing was about proving the system worked and getting business sign-off to move on to the next task. Experience taught me it must be about proving the organisation could work. I've sat through countless testing cycles where every script passed, yet everyone in the room still lacked confidence. The software was functioning exactly as designed, but the business hadn't yet proven it could operate in the future state.

For me, testing is where assumptions meet operational reality. It should validate not only the technology but also the governance, business processes, decision-making, and operational capabilities that will be in place after go-live. A successful test doesn't simply confirm that the system is ready; it gives the organisation confidence that it is. (Peter)

Part Seven - Deployment

Chapter 22 - Preparing for Go-Live

Go-live is often described as a technical milestone, but from an Organisational Change Management (OCM) perspective it is primarily a business milestone. It is the point where responsibility transitions from the project team to the operational business. Technology may be deployed in a single weekend, but organisational adoption begins the moment people are expected to perform their work differently on Monday morning.

One of the greatest misconceptions in EAM implementations is believing that deployment belongs to the IT team or the System Integrator. While they may execute the technical deployment activities, the business owns the operational deployment. They are the people who will approve work orders, manage asset information, schedule maintenance, procure materials, respond to failures and report performance. If they are not genuinely prepared, then the implementation has not truly gone live.

Preparing for go-live means confirming that people understand not only how to use the system, but also why the organisation is changing. They should understand the new business processes, governance, decision-making responsibilities and expectations that accompany the technology. It also means confirming that leaders are prepared to support their teams through uncertainty rather than assuming training alone has solved the problem.

Good OCM treats go-live as the beginning of a behavioural transition rather than the end of a project. Readiness activities should progressively build confidence, identify concerns, and resolve issues well before deployment day. Organisations that involve operational teams throughout design, testing and preparation rarely experience the shock that accompanies poorly managed implementations because people have already begun the journey long before the software is switched on.

Ultimately, successful deployment is achieved when the business feels ownership of the solution rather than feeling that a project has imposed another system upon them.

Readiness checkpoints

Many projects measure readiness through project completion metrics. Configuration is complete. Testing has passed. Training has finished. Documentation has been approved. While these are important project milestones, they are not necessarily indicators that the organisation is ready to operate differently.

Organisational readiness checkpoints ask very different questions.

Do frontline workers understand how their daily work will change? Can supervisors confidently manage work using the new processes? Are planners comfortable scheduling within the new EAM? Are stores personnel prepared for new inventory practices? Are executives ready to review different performance measures? Has the business accepted ownership of new governance arrangements?

These checkpoints provide opportunities to pause and honestly assess whether people are genuinely prepared before progressing to the next stage.

Effective readiness reviews include representatives from across the business, not just project managers. Operations, maintenance, engineering, supply chain, finance, IT, health and safety and executive leadership should all contribute to determining whether the organisation is genuinely prepared.

Importantly, readiness checkpoints should not become "green-by-default" reporting exercises in which every issue is forced into an acceptable status simply because the timeline demands it. Mature organisations allow readiness assessments to identify uncomfortable truths. Delaying deployment by several weeks is often significantly cheaper than recovering from months of operational disruption.

OCM practitioners often become the voice of organisational reality. While technical teams may report that the system is ready, change practitioners help determine whether the people are equally ready to succeed.

Cutover

Cutover is frequently viewed as a highly technical exercise involving system migrations, integrations, infrastructure changes and production deployments. While these activities are essential, they represent only one part of the transition. From an OCM perspective, cutover is equally about transitioning people, responsibilities and operational ownership.

Business cutover activities include far more than simply logging into a new system. Teams may need to complete outstanding work orders, close existing transactions, reconcile inventory, verify asset data, prepare operational procedures, communicate changes to contractors and customers, and ensure key decision makers are available throughout the transition period.

Clear ownership becomes critical during cutover. Everyone should know who is making decisions, who approves contingency plans, who authorises rollback activities and who can resolve operational issues quickly. Confusion during cutover creates delays precisely when rapid decision-making is most important.

OCM also recognises the emotional dimension of cutover. For many employees, this represents the first time they are required to stop using familiar tools and adopt new ways of working. Anxiety often peaks during this period. Visible leadership, accessible support and frequent communication help maintain confidence while uncertainty is highest.

Successful cutovers therefore combine technical precision with organisational preparedness. The system changes over a weekend, but the organisation changes through careful planning, coordinated leadership and active business participation.

Risk

Every deployment carries risk, but many implementation risks have very little to do with technology. Organisational Change Management broadens the definition of risk beyond software defects and infrastructure failures to include human, organisational and behavioural risks.

Examples include managers who fail to reinforce new processes, employees reverting to spreadsheets, inaccurate master data being accepted because people do not trust the new system, or critical knowledge residing with individuals who are unavailable during deployment.

Many of these risks emerge because organisations underestimate the importance of preparing people. The technical solution may perform exactly as designed, while operational performance deteriorates because behaviours have not changed.

Business representatives play a vital role in identifying risks that project teams may never recognise. They understand seasonal workloads, shutdown schedules, regulatory inspections, workforce availability, contractor dependencies and operational constraints that can significantly influence deployment success.

Risk management therefore becomes a shared responsibility rather than a project management activity. Operational leaders, business SMEs, technical teams and OCM practitioners should continually review emerging risks and agree mitigation strategies together.

The organisations that experience smoother deployments are rarely those with the fewest risks. They are the organisations that identify risks early, discuss them openly and actively prepare people to manage them.

Support

No matter how well an implementation has been planned, people will require support after go-live. The objective is not to eliminate every question before deployment, but to ensure employees know where to obtain timely, knowledgeable assistance when they need it.

Effective support combines technical expertise with business understanding. Users often describe operational problems rather than technical problems. A maintenance planner may say they cannot schedule work, while the underlying issue lies in workflow configuration, business rules, or incomplete data. Support personnel therefore need to understand both the system and the operational context.

Hypercare periods provide intensive support immediately after deployment. However, organisations should avoid viewing hypercare as simply an extension of the project. Instead, it represents an accelerated learning phase in which support teams identify recurring issues, improve documentation, update training materials, and strengthen organisational capability.

Business champions, super users and local experts play a particularly valuable role because they speak the language of their colleagues. Employees often seek assistance from trusted peers before contacting formal support teams, making local capability one of the strongest contributors to successful adoption.

The goal of deployment support is not merely resolving incidents. It is building confidence until the new ways of working become routine.

Communication

Communication reaches its most critical point during deployment. People need accurate, timely and practical information that helps them understand what is happening, when it is happening and what they need to do.

Too many go-live communications focus almost exclusively on project milestones—systems becoming available, deployment schedules and technical updates. While these are important, employees are usually asking much simpler questions. What changes for me tomorrow? Who do I contact if something goes wrong? What should I do differently? What happens if I cannot complete my work?

OCM encourages frequent, honest, two-way communication. Rather than simply broadcasting information, organisations should actively listen to concerns, respond quickly and adjust messaging based on emerging issues.

Communication should also come from multiple voices. Executives explain the strategic importance of the change. Operational leaders explain what it means for daily work. Business champions provide practical advice. Project teams communicate deployment activities. Together, these perspectives create credibility and reinforce consistency.

Importantly, communication does not end on go-live day. The weeks following deployment are often when employees most need encouragement, recognition and ongoing guidance. Celebrating early successes, acknowledging challenges, and sharing lessons learned reinforce the organisation's commitment not only to implementing an EAM system but also to successfully embedding new ways of working for the long term.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Go-live readiness is measured by organisational confidence, not by project completion alone.	Operational readiness should be formally assessed before authorising deployment.
Readiness checkpoints should validate people, processes and leadership, not just technology.	Cutover plans should include clear governance, approvals and contingency arrangements.
Employees should know what changes on day one and where to seek support.	Business continuity plans should protect critical operations throughout deployment.
Leaders should increase their visibility as go-live approaches.	Risks identified during readiness reviews should be resolved or formally accepted before deployment.
Effective communication reduces uncertainty and builds confidence immediately before deployment.	Operational responsibilities during cutover should be clearly documented and communicated.
Organisations that prepare well experience smoother transitions and faster adoption.	Go-live should only proceed when operational controls remain fully effective.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Deliver
Also Supports	Design
Why it matters	Successful deployment depends upon coordinated organisational, operational and technical readiness.

Go-live has never been the finish line in any project I've worked on. It's the moment responsibility begins shifting from the project to the business. Every go-live decision introduces operational risk, so I've always believed it should be supported by evidence rather than optimism. Leaders should be confident that governance is operating, that support arrangements are in place, that critical information is reliable, and that business owners are prepared to make decisions without relying on the project team.

The best go-live decisions I've witnessed weren't driven by schedule; they were driven by organisational confidence. (Peter)

Chapter 23 – Hypercare

Hypercare is often misunderstood as simply an extended period of IT support following go-live. In reality, Hypercare is the point at which the project stops being a project and becomes the organisation's new way of working. It is the period where the technical solution, the business processes, the people, the leadership and the organisational culture are tested together in a live operational environment.

For Organisational Change Management, Hypercare represents the culmination of months, and often years, of preparation. It is where communications, leadership engagement, training, business readiness, stakeholder engagement and capability development either prove successful or reveal the gaps that still exist. For Management of Change, operational risk is actively managed as people begin performing work differently, using new systems, new information, and often new responsibilities.

In an EAM implementation, Hypercare is particularly important because maintenance activities do not stop when a new system is deployed. Assets still fail. Work orders still need to be raised. Preventive maintenance continues. Parts must still be ordered. Contractors still need access to work. Regulatory obligations remain unchanged. The organisation cannot afford a learning period that compromises safety, reliability or compliance.

The objective of Hypercare is therefore not simply to fix software defects. Its purpose is to stabilise the entire operating model.

Questions commonly asked during Hypercare include:

- Are people actually following the new processes?
- Are managers reinforcing the expected behaviours?
- Are data issues preventing people from trusting the system?
- Are workarounds beginning to emerge?

- Are decisions being made differently?
- Are operational risks increasing or decreasing?
- Where does the business require additional support?

This is where technical support alone is insufficient.

Many organisations establish "war rooms" or command centres during Hypercare. While these can be effective for coordinating technical issues, they are only part of the solution. Equally important is having business representatives, change practitioners, process owners, trainers, asset managers and operational leaders working together to understand not only what is happening, but why it is happening.

The success of Hypercare is measured by more than system stability. It is measured by business stability.

A successful Hypercare period gradually reduces dependency on the project team while increasing confidence within operational teams. By the end of Hypercare, the business should feel a sense of ownership of both the system and the new ways of working.

Business support

Business support during Hypercare extends well beyond answering "how do I click this button?" questions. Effective support helps people understand how to perform their work successfully within the new operating environment.

One of the greatest mistakes organisations make is assuming that once training has been completed, users are fully capable of working independently. Training teaches capability in a controlled environment. Hypercare develops competence under real operational pressure.

The business support model should include people who understand:

- the business processes
- the operational priorities
- the asset management principles
- the system functionality
- the organisational objectives

These individuals often become translators between technical specialists and operational staff.

For example, a planner may report that preventative maintenance schedules are not appearing correctly. The technical team may investigate scheduling logic, while the business support person recognises that planners have unintentionally changed work classifications because they misunderstood new planning rules.

The problem is not technical. It is behavioural.

Business support therefore helps identify whether issues originate from:

- system configuration

- poor data
- unclear business processes
- insufficient training
- competing procedures
- leadership decisions
- misunderstanding of roles
- organisational habits

This distinction prevents unnecessary software changes while helping the organisation continue learning.

Effective business support is also highly visible.

Rather than expecting users to raise support tickets, successful organisations place knowledgeable people alongside operational teams. Walking the floor, visiting depots, sitting with planners and supervisors and observing work in progress allows support staff to identify problems before they become incidents.

Business support is therefore proactive rather than reactive.

As confidence grows, the support model gradually transitions from project ownership to normal business operations. This ensures the organisation develops self-sufficiency rather than becoming dependent on the implementation team.

Operational coaching

Coaching during Hypercare differs significantly from formal classroom training.

Training explains what to do.

Coaching helps people understand why they are doing it and builds confidence as they perform real work.

In an EAM implementation, many users encounter situations during their first weeks of operation that were impossible to replicate during training. Unexpected breakdowns, emergency work, contractor requests, material shortages, conflicting priorities and regulatory requirements all combine to create operational complexity.

Operational coaching helps people make good decisions within these situations.

Rather than immediately solving users' problems, effective coaches ask questions.

- "What outcome are you trying to achieve?"
- "What information do you need?"
- "Which business process applies here?"
- "What decision would you normally make?"

This approach develops critical thinking rather than dependence.

Operational coaching should involve supervisors and frontline leaders as much as project resources.

One of the strongest indicators of sustainable change is when leaders begin coaching their own teams instead of referring every question back to the project.

Coaching also provides valuable insights into organisational readiness.

Repeated questions often indicate:

- confusing business processes
- unclear governance
- poor documentation
- conflicting procedures
- inadequate training
- cultural resistance
- inconsistent leadership messages

Rather than viewing these as user problems, OCM views them as opportunities to improve the organisation.

Over time, coaching conversations shift from system navigation to improving asset management practices.

This marks the transition from learning software to improving organisational capability.

Ultimately, operational coaching helps embed new behaviours until they become normal ways of working.

Rapid issue resolution

Every implementation encounters issues after go-live.

The difference between successful and unsuccessful implementations is not whether problems occur, but how quickly they are identified, understood and resolved.

Rapid issue resolution requires more than an efficient help desk.

It requires collaboration between technical specialists, business representatives, change practitioners and operational leaders.

One of the first activities during Hypercare should be establishing a clear issue triage process.

Not every reported problem is a software defect.

An issue may arise because of:

- incorrect master data
- process ambiguity
- misunderstanding
- training gaps
- configuration decisions
- business rules
- user error
- infrastructure limitations

- competing operational priorities

Treating every issue as a technical defect wastes valuable time and often creates unnecessary system changes.

Rapid issue resolution starts with understanding the root cause.

OCM contributes by analysing behavioural patterns.

If multiple users experience the same problem, the issue may lie with communication or training.

If one location experiences problems while another does not, local practices may be responsible.

If managers are bypassing new workflows, governance may require reinforcement.

Fast resolution also has a psychological impact.

Users quickly develop opinions about a new system.

When issues remain unresolved for extended periods, confidence deteriorates, and workarounds begin to emerge.

Conversely, visible, transparent and responsive support reassures people that the organisation is listening and acting.

Hypercare should therefore include regular issue review meetings where technical, business and change teams jointly assess trends rather than individual incidents.

The objective is not simply to close tickets. It is to remove barriers to successful adoption.

Confidence building

Technology alone does not create confidence. People gain confidence through repeated successful experiences.

Following go-live, many employees worry about making mistakes.

- Maintenance planners fear disrupting schedules.
- Warehouse staff fear incorrect inventory transactions.
- Supervisors worry about reporting inaccuracies.
- Tradespeople fear recording work incorrectly.
- Managers worry that operational performance may decline.

Confidence building is therefore a deliberate activity during Hypercare.

Leaders play a critical role.

When leaders remain visible, acknowledge challenges openly and reinforce that learning is expected, employees are more willing to engage with the new system.

Conversely, when leaders criticise mistakes or immediately compare the new system to the old one, confidence deteriorates rapidly.

Confidence also grows through early successes.

Examples include:

- successfully completing preventative maintenance
- accurately planning shutdown work
- producing meaningful reports
- locating asset history quickly
- reducing duplicate work
- demonstrating improved scheduling
- making better maintenance decisions

These wins should be celebrated and communicated across the organisation.

OCM practitioners should actively collect these stories.

Real examples from operational teams are significantly more powerful than project communications.

Confidence also comes from consistency.

When managers reinforce the same expectations, support teams provide consistent advice and business processes remain stable, people gradually stop questioning the change and begin accepting it as normal.

Eventually, conversations shift from "How do I use the system?" to "How can we improve the way we manage our assets?"

That is a powerful indicator that organisational change has taken hold.

Measuring adoption

Go-live is not the finish line.

Neither is system availability.

The true measure of success is adoption.

Adoption is often mismeasured using login statistics or training completion rates. While these metrics may indicate activity, they reveal very little about whether organisational change has actually occurred.

In an EAM environment, meaningful adoption measures should combine system usage with business outcomes and behavioural indicators.

Examples include:

- Percentage of maintenance work managed through the EAM.
- Work orders completed using the new process rather than legacy methods.
- Preventive maintenance compliance.
- Planning and scheduling effectiveness.
- Data quality improvements.
- Reduction in manual spreadsheets and shadow systems.
- Asset history completeness.

- Decision-making based on system information.
- Leadership use of EAM reports during operational meetings.
- User confidence and satisfaction.

OCM also looks beyond quantitative measures.

Observation, interviews, coaching sessions and readiness assessments often reveal insights that dashboards cannot.

For example, a site may demonstrate excellent system usage while still relying on informal workarounds outside the system. Another site may have lower transaction volumes but display stronger understanding, ownership and process discipline.

Adoption should therefore be viewed across multiple dimensions:

- System adoption – Are people using the technology?
- Process adoption – Are they following the intended business processes?
- Behavioural adoption – Have habits and decision-making changed?
- Leadership adoption – Are leaders reinforcing the new ways of working?
- Business adoption – Is the organisation achieving the intended asset management outcomes?

Measuring adoption enables Hypercare teams to identify where additional coaching, communication, leadership intervention or process improvement is required.

The end goal is not simply a functioning EAM system. It is a confident organisation that trusts its information, embraces new ways of working, and continuously improves how it manages its assets. Hypercare concludes successfully not when support calls cease, but when the business no longer sees the system as "new" and sees it as the way work gets done.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Hypercare is about building confidence, not simply resolving incidents.	Operational issues should be prioritised according to business risk rather than project convenience.
Employees should feel supported rather than judged as they adapt to new ways of working.	Temporary workarounds introduced during Hypercare should be formally assessed and controlled.
Rapid access to knowledgeable support accelerates adoption and reduces frustration.	Incident management should ensure operational risks are identified and mitigated quickly.
Hypercare provides valuable insights into training, process and system improvements.	Emergency changes should still follow appropriate governance wherever practical.
Leadership presence during Hypercare reinforces organisational commitment to success.	Root cause analysis should address systemic operational issues rather than focusing solely on symptoms.

Confidence grows when support teams solve problems collaboratively with the business.	Hypercare concludes when operational stability (not simply issue volume) has been achieved.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Deliver
Also Supports	Depart
Why it matters	Hypercare bridges project delivery and sustainable business ownership by building confidence and capability.

Hypercare reveals how the organisation actually operates under pressure. Hidden workarounds emerge, governance is tested, and unresolved accountabilities become visible.

Each issue should be prioritised by operational risk, traced to its root cause and assigned to a clear business owner. Resolution should strengthen controls, clarify ownership and improve organisational capability, not simply close a defect.

Every issue should leave the organisation stronger than it was the day before.

Hypercare should end only when the agreed exit criteria are met, residual risks and open issues have been formally accepted, and ownership has transferred to the named BAU functions. Exit approval should be based on evidence of operational stability, support capability and clear accountability, not simply the passage of time. (Peter)

Chapter 24 - Embedding New Ways of Working

One of the greatest misconceptions in Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementations is that go-live represents the end of the project. In reality, it marks the beginning of organisational change. The challenge is no longer introducing a new system; it is helping people let go of old habits that may have been built over decades. Organisational Change Management (OCM) is fundamentally about replacing familiar behaviours with new ones until the new way becomes "how we work."

People rarely resist technology for its own sake. They resist uncertainty and the loss of confidence that comes from no longer being experts. Many experienced maintenance planners, supervisors, and technicians have developed personal methods that have served them well, ranging from spreadsheets and notebooks to local databases, whiteboards, emails, or informal conversations. While these methods often evolved for good reasons, they frequently create fragmented information, duplicated effort, and inconsistent decision-making.

An EAM implementation often introduces far more than a new application. It introduces new operating models, such as centralised planning, standardised work management, role clarity, approval workflows, and enterprise-wide asset visibility. These changes require people to trust information they may no longer personally control.

Embedding new ways of working therefore requires deliberate reinforcement. Leaders must continually explain not only how the new process works, but why it exists. People need to understand that centralised planning is not about taking control away from sites; it is about improving prioritisation, reducing reactive work and enabling better resource utilisation across the organisation.

Old systems also need to be retired decisively. One of the quickest ways to undermine adoption is allowing legacy systems or unofficial workarounds to continue indefinitely. If planners continue to maintain spreadsheets "just in case," or supervisors continue to accept paperwork requests, employees receive a clear message that the organisation lacks confidence in its own solution.

Embedding also requires patience. Habits do not disappear overnight. Individuals need coaching, encouragement and opportunities to succeed using the new process. Small wins should be recognised publicly, while mistakes should be treated as learning opportunities rather than evidence that the new system has failed.

Ultimately, embedding new ways of working is about changing confidence before changing competence. When people believe the organisation is committed to the new approach and see leaders consistently using it themselves, the new behaviours gradually replace the old. The technology becomes ordinary, and the organisation begins to realise the value it has invested in it.

Reinforcement

Training creates awareness. Reinforcement creates habits.

Many organisations invest heavily in communications, workshops and training before go-live, only to dramatically reduce support once the system is operational. Unfortunately, this is exactly when reinforcement becomes most important. Human beings naturally return to familiar behaviours under pressure, particularly when operational demands increase.

Reinforcement is the ongoing process of helping people consistently choose the new way over the old way until it becomes second nature. It is not about policing compliance. It is about increasing confidence and removing barriers that encourage old behaviours to reappear.

In an EAM implementation, reinforcement may involve observing planners during scheduling meetings, coaching supervisors on approving work electronically rather than verbally, helping technicians record accurate completion information, or working with asset managers to rely on system reports rather than manually created spreadsheets.

Positive reinforcement is considerably more effective than criticism. Celebrating teams who demonstrate excellent data quality, effective planning or improved work management sends a stronger message than focusing solely on those who struggle.

Reinforcement should also be immediate. If someone reverts to an old legacy system or bypasses the approved workflow, the discussion should occur while the experience is still fresh. Delayed feedback allows poor habits to reestablish themselves.

Managers play a crucial role because employees watch what leaders reinforce. If managers continue requesting information outside the EAM system or make decisions based on manually prepared reports, employees quickly conclude that the new processes are optional.

Successful organisations also reinforce through visible measures, success stories and regular conversations. Every interaction should answer the same question:

"Is this helping people become more confident using the new way of working?"

Over time, reinforcement transforms change from an initiative into an organisational norm.

Performance management

People naturally focus on what is measured.

Performance management therefore becomes one of the strongest drivers of behavioural change after an EAM implementation. If organisations continue measuring performance using old metrics, employees will continue behaving in old ways regardless of how much training has been delivered.

For example, if maintenance supervisors are measured only on how quickly work is completed, planning quality may suffer. If planners are rewarded for producing schedules without measuring schedule compliance or work readiness, planning becomes a paperwork exercise rather than an operational discipline.

OCM encourages organisations to align performance measures with the future operating model. Metrics should reinforce behaviours such as proactive maintenance, effective planning, data quality, accurate work order completion, asset reliability, and cross-team collaboration.

Importantly, performance management should extend beyond operational staff. Leaders should also be measured on how effectively they support adoption, coach their teams and reinforce the agreed ways of working. Change is everyone's responsibility, not just the project team's.

Performance conversations should be developmental rather than punitive. Employees need opportunities to understand why certain behaviours matter and how they contribute to organisational outcomes.

The EAM system itself often provides powerful visibility through dashboards and reporting. Rather than producing separate management reports, organisations should increasingly rely on system-generated information. This reinforces trust in the data while reducing manual effort.

When performance measures consistently support the desired behaviours, employees gradually stop asking, "What do I have to do?" and begin asking, "How can we improve?" That shift represents genuine organisational change.

Governance

Governance provides the structure that protects new ways of working from slowly drifting back to old habits.

Without effective governance, exceptions gradually become normal practice. Temporary workarounds become permanent processes. Local variations multiply. Before long, the organisation finds itself operating much as it did before the implementation, despite having invested millions in new technology.

Governance is therefore about more than approving changes or monitoring compliance. It is about preserving organisational discipline while allowing continuous improvement.

Clear ownership is fundamental. Business Process Owners should be accountable for maintaining standard processes, approving changes and ensuring consistency across the enterprise. Governance forums should carefully evaluate requests for process changes, distinguishing genuine improvements from attempts to recreate legacy practices within the new system.

Decision-making should also remain business-led. While IT supports the platform and vendors provide technical expertise, governance of business processes belongs to the business itself.

Effective governance includes monitoring adoption, reviewing data quality, assessing process compliance, tracking benefits and identifying emerging risks before they become widespread issues.

Importantly, governance should encourage learning rather than bureaucracy. Employees need confidence that they can raise concerns, suggest improvements and report practical challenges without being perceived as resistant to change.

When governance is visible, fair and consistently applied, employees develop trust that the organisation is committed to maintaining a single, coherent way of working.

Continuous learning

The most successful EAM organisations recognise that learning never ends at go-live.

Technology evolves. Business priorities change. Employees move into new roles. New staff join the organisation. Operational practices mature. Continuous learning ensures the organisation evolves alongside its systems rather than gradually falling behind them.

From an OCM perspective, continuous learning extends well beyond refresher training. It includes coaching, mentoring, communities of practice, peer learning, knowledge sharing and lessons learned from operational experience.

As people become more confident using the EAM system, their questions also change. Initially they ask, "How do I complete this transaction?" Later they ask, "How can we use this information to improve reliability?" Continuous learning supports this progression from system competency to business capability.

Learning should also incorporate feedback from operational teams. Those using the system every day often identify opportunities to simplify processes, improve usability or refine business practices. Capturing these insights strengthens both the system and the organisation.

Importantly, continuous learning reinforces the message that adopting the new operating model is not a one-off event but an ongoing journey. Organisations should regularly revisit training materials, update standard operating procedures, share success stories and celebrate improvements achieved through better use of the system.

Perhaps most importantly, continuous learning helps people let go of the belief that the old way was the only way. As employees experience the benefits of improved planning, better information, stronger collaboration and more reliable assets, confidence replaces scepticism.

That is when organisational change truly becomes embedded, not because people were forced to change, but because they can no longer imagine working any other way.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Embedding change begins after go-live, not before it.	New operational procedures should become the formally approved standard for business operations.
Reinforcement should become part of everyday leadership routines.	Legacy procedures should be formally withdrawn to avoid conflicting practices.
Performance management should recognise and encourage desired behaviours.	Governance should ensure operational compliance with newly established practices.
Continuous learning sustains adoption long after formal training concludes.	Operational audits should verify that approved changes are consistently applied.
Old habits disappear when new behaviours consistently produce better outcomes.	Deviations from approved operating practices should be reviewed through established governance processes.
Sustainable change occurs when employees no longer think about the "old system."	Embedding change requires ongoing monitoring to ensure operational integrity is maintained.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Depart
Also Supports	Deliver
Why it matters	Reinforcement transforms initial adoption into lasting organisational habits and behaviours.

I've never viewed go-live as the finish line. In many ways, I see it as the beginning. This is where people stop practising and start relying on the new way of working to perform their jobs every day.

Some of the most successful organisations I've worked with invested more effort after go-live than before it. They understood that confidence, habits and culture are reinforced through consistent leadership, coaching and support. (Martin)

Real change begins when the project team starts disappearing. Throughout my career, I've found that organisations don't sustain change because people remember the training; they sustain it when leaders consistently reinforce expectations, governance becomes routine, and operational decisions reflect the new way of working.

Embedding change is less about reminding people what to do and more about ensuring the organisation naturally supports the desired behaviours every day. That's when a project finally becomes part of normal operations. (Peter)

Part Eight - Sustaining Enterprise Asset Management

Chapter 25 - Benefits Realisation

One of the greatest misconceptions in Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementations is that benefits are achieved at go-live. In reality, go-live is simply the point at which an organisation can begin realising value. Organisational Change Management (OCM) plays a critical role in ensuring that the investment made in technology, data and process redesign translates into sustainable business outcomes rather than becoming another underutilised enterprise system.

Benefits realisation is fundamentally about ensuring that people consistently work differently over time. An EAM system can provide better planning, scheduling, reliability analysis and asset information, but only if planners trust the data, supervisors follow new workflows, maintainers complete work orders accurately and leaders use the information to make decisions. If behaviours do not change, the promised benefits remain theoretical regardless of how capable the software may be.

Effective OCM establishes benefits long before implementation begins. Rather than leaving benefits as high-level statements in a business case, they are translated into practical operational outcomes that employees understand. For example, "improved asset reliability" translates into better preventive maintenance compliance, higher-quality failure reporting, improved planning discipline, and more consistent decision-making. Every role understands how their daily activities contribute to the organisation's broader objectives.

Benefits should also be owned by the business, not by the project team. Projects deliver capability; operations deliver value. Once the implementation team departs, operational leaders become responsible for maintaining the behaviours that continue to generate those benefits. OCM supports this transition by embedding accountability into leadership routines, governance forums and performance management.

Benefits realisation is therefore a continuous business discipline rather than a project milestone. Organisations that sustain value continually measure adoption, reinforce new behaviours, refine processes and improve capability. They understand that technology enables improvement, but people create the benefits.

Defining Value

Value means different things to different stakeholders. Executives may focus on financial return, maintenance managers on equipment reliability, planners on schedule compliance, technicians on easier ways of working and regulators on compliance. One of OCM's responsibilities is to align these differing perspectives into a shared understanding of what success actually looks like.

Too often organisations define value only in financial terms. While reduced maintenance costs or lower inventory holdings are important, Enterprise Asset Management exists to improve how physical assets deliver services safely, reliably and efficiently throughout their lifecycle. Value therefore extends beyond dollars to include better decision-making, increased confidence in data, reduced operational risk, and greater organisational capability.

Defining value requires meaningful conversations with the business. Rather than asking, "What features do you want?" OCM asks questions such as:

- What problems are we trying to solve?
- What will people be doing differently?
- How will work improve?
- What decisions will become easier?
- How will customers notice the difference?

These conversations shift attention from software functionality towards operational outcomes.

Value should also be defined across multiple time horizons. Some benefits appear immediately, such as improved visibility of work. Others emerge over months or years through better maintenance strategies, improved reliability engineering, stronger lifecycle planning and more informed capital investment decisions. Sustaining an EAM environment means recognising that many of the largest benefits compound over time.

Ultimately, value is created when better information enables better decisions, which in turn become better organisational habits.

Measuring value

If value cannot be measured, it quickly becomes difficult to defend continued investment in Enterprise Asset Management. OCM therefore encourages organisations to measure not only system activity but also business outcomes and behavioural change.

Many organisations focus heavily on system usage metrics, such as login statistics or the number of completed work orders. While useful, these measures reveal little about whether people are working differently or whether business performance is improving.

Measuring value requires connecting behavioural indicators with operational and strategic outcomes.

Good measurement combines quantitative and qualitative information. Quantitative measures might include maintenance schedule compliance, emergency work percentages, asset availability or planning efficiency. Qualitative measures might include employee confidence, leadership observations, customer feedback or perceptions of data quality.

Importantly, measures should tell a story rather than exist as isolated numbers. For example, improved planning quality should lead to better schedule compliance, which should reduce reactive work, improve equipment reliability and ultimately reduce maintenance costs. Demonstrating these relationships helps reinforce the importance of behavioural change.

Measurement should also evolve as organisational maturity increases. Early implementation focuses on adoption and process compliance. As capability develops, measures shift towards optimisation, reliability improvement, lifecycle performance and strategic asset management.

Measuring value is not about proving the project was successful. It is about continuously understanding where additional value can still be created.

Operational performance

Operational performance is where employees experience the impact of Enterprise Asset Management every day. It is reflected in how work is planned, scheduled, executed, recorded and improved. Sustaining operational performance depends less on technology than on consistent organisational behaviours.

An EAM system introduces standard processes designed to improve efficiency and reliability. However, if planners bypass planning workflows, supervisors ignore schedules or technicians fail to record quality information, operational performance quickly declines despite the presence of sophisticated software.

OCM supports operational performance by reinforcing the habits that produce consistent execution. This includes coaching supervisors, supporting planners, building confidence among frontline teams, and ensuring operational leaders actively use EAM information during daily decision-making.

Operational performance should also balance efficiency with effectiveness. Completing more work orders is not necessarily better if the work is poorly planned or addresses the wrong maintenance priorities. High-performing organisations measure work quality, planning maturity, schedule adherence, asset reliability and learning rather than focusing solely on productivity.

Perhaps most importantly, operational performance improves when people trust both the system and one another. Trust encourages accurate data entry, proactive reporting and collaborative planning across maintenance, operations, engineering and supply functions. OCM helps build this trust through engagement, communication and leadership support.

Sustainable operational excellence is therefore achieved when disciplined behaviours become normal ways of working rather than project-driven activities.

Lead and Lag OCM Measures

One of the challenges in sustaining Enterprise Asset Management is distinguishing between indicators that predict future success and those that report historical performance. OCM relies on both lead and lag measures to understand whether change is taking hold.

Lead measures are behavioural indicators. They indicate whether people are performing activities expected to improve business outcomes. Examples include leadership visibility, coaching conversations, training completion, planner participation, preventive maintenance planning quality, data quality improvements, process compliance and active use of planning meetings.

Lag measures are outcome indicators. They reflect the results achieved after behavioural change. Examples include reduced reactive maintenance, increased asset availability, lower maintenance costs, fewer safety incidents, higher customer satisfaction, and improved regulatory performance.

An organisation that monitors only lag measures often discovers problems after performance has already deteriorated. Conversely, organisations that monitor lead measures can intervene early by reinforcing behaviours before business outcomes decline.

Effective OCM dashboards therefore combine both perspectives. They ask questions such as:

- Are leaders demonstrating the desired behaviours?
- Are teams consistently following new processes?
- Is confidence increasing?
- Are planners using the system effectively?
- Are operational results improving because of these behaviours?

By linking behavioural indicators to business outcomes, organisations gain a much clearer understanding of how change drives sustained performance.

Business performance

Enterprise Asset Management should ultimately improve overall business performance, not simply maintenance performance. OCM helps ensure that the organisation recognises this broader perspective by connecting operational improvements to enterprise objectives.

Improved business performance may be reflected through reduced operating costs, higher production capacity, improved regulatory compliance, better capital planning, stronger risk management or more predictable financial outcomes. None of these outcomes occurs because software exists; they occur because people consistently use improved processes supported by quality information.

OCM encourages leaders to move beyond departmental optimisation. Maintenance, operations, engineering, finance, procurement and supply chain must collaborate around shared objectives rather than optimise their own local measures at the expense of enterprise performance.

Business performance also depends on organisational capability. As employees become more confident in planning, reliability engineering, asset information management, and decision-making, the organisation becomes increasingly capable of adapting to future challenges. Capability itself becomes a strategic asset.

Sustaining business performance therefore requires continuous reinforcement, as well as attention from governance and leadership. High-performing organisations never assume that successful implementation guarantees ongoing success.

Strategic performance

Enterprise Asset Management exists to support long-term organisational strategy rather than simply improving day-to-day maintenance activities. OCM helps ensure that operational improvements remain connected to strategic objectives throughout the life of the EAM system.

Strategic performance considers whether the organisation is becoming more resilient, more sustainable, more efficient and better positioned to manage its asset portfolio over decades rather than months. It asks whether better maintenance decisions are contributing to broader corporate ambitions.

An effective EAM environment supports strategic initiatives such as asset lifecycle optimisation, capital investment planning, sustainability targets, resilience, risk reduction and regulatory compliance. OCM ensures employees understand how their everyday activities contribute to these broader organisational goals.

Leaders play a significant role in sustaining strategic alignment. When executives regularly discuss asset performance, reliability trends, investment decisions and capability development, employees recognise that Enterprise Asset Management is a business strategy rather than simply an IT system.

Strategic performance is therefore achieved when the organisation consistently makes better long-term decisions because reliable information, capable people and disciplined governance work together.

Employee Outcomes

The success of Enterprise Asset Management depends heavily on employee experience. People who understand the purpose of change, possess the necessary capability and feel supported are far more likely to adopt new ways of working and sustain them over time.

OCM focuses on creating positive employee outcomes rather than simply delivering training. Employees should leave an implementation feeling more capable, more informed and more confident than when they started. They should understand not only how to use the system but why their work contributes to broader organisational success.

Positive employee outcomes include increased confidence in decision-making, reduced frustration with inefficient processes, improved collaboration across teams, clearer accountability, stronger leadership support, and greater opportunities for professional development.

Trust also becomes an important outcome. Employees need confidence that information entered into the EAM system is accurate, that leaders will use it constructively, and that consistent behaviours are recognised and rewarded.

When employees experience genuine improvements in how work is performed, resistance declines naturally because the new way of working makes sense. Sustaining Enterprise Asset Management therefore becomes much easier because people choose to work within the system rather than being forced to do so.

Customer outcomes

While Enterprise Asset Management often focuses internally on maintenance and operations, its ultimate purpose is to improve customer service delivery. Whether customers are electricity consumers, passengers, water users, patients, manufacturers or members of the public, they experience the outcomes of effective asset management every day.

Reliable assets produce reliable services. Better maintenance planning reduces equipment failures. Higher quality asset information enables faster restoration after incidents. Improved lifecycle management reduces unplanned outages and service disruptions. Every improvement within the EAM environment ultimately influences customer experience.

OCM helps employees recognise this connection. A technician completing an accurate work order is not simply satisfying a system requirement; they are contributing to future maintenance decisions that may prevent service interruptions. A planner developing better schedules is helping ensure critical assets remain available when customers need them.

Customer outcomes may include improved service reliability, faster response times, increased safety, greater confidence in infrastructure, stronger regulatory compliance and improved public trust. These outcomes reinforce why sustaining EAM capability matters long after implementation.

Ultimately, the greatest measure of success is not whether an organisation has implemented an Enterprise Asset Management system, but whether customers consistently receive safer, more reliable and higher-quality services because the organisation has changed the way it manages its assets.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Benefits are realised through changed behaviours rather than implemented technology.	Operational improvements should be measured against the objectives approved during change authorisation.

Employee adoption is one of the strongest leading indicators of future business value.	Operational performance should confirm that changes have improved reliability, safety or efficiency.
Success measures should reflect customer, employee and organisational outcomes.	Governance should validate that expected operational benefits have been achieved without introducing new risks.
Organisations should celebrate behavioural improvements as much as financial outcomes.	Post-implementation reviews should evaluate both intended and unintended operational impacts.
Benefits realisation should continue well beyond project closure.	Asset performance measures should demonstrate that operational integrity has been maintained or improved.
Continuous measurement encourages continuous improvement.	Operational value should be evidenced through measurable improvements rather than assumptions.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Depart
Also Supports	Define, Deliver
Why it matters	Benefits defined early must be measured, sustained and continuously improved after implementation.

New ways of working are not embedded because people are reminded to follow them. They become embedded when the business owns the controls that sustain them.

This requires clear process ownership, defined performance expectations, established decision routines and consistent management of exceptions. Governance must also transfer deliberately from the project into named operational forums and accountable business roles.

The project may introduce the change, but the business must govern its operations from that point onward. (Peter)

Chapter 26 - Continuous Improvement

One of the greatest misconceptions in Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) is that improvement finishes when the system goes live. In reality, go-live is simply the point where the organisation begins learning how well its new ways of working perform in practice. Organisational Change Management (OCM) recognises that continuous improvement is not a separate activity undertaken months later; it should be embedded into the way the organisation operates from the beginning of the transformation.

Continuous improvement extends well beyond improving software configuration. It considers people, processes, technology, behaviours, culture, governance and leadership together. An organisation may identify opportunities to streamline planning processes, improve data quality, simplify workflows, enhance decision-making or

strengthen collaboration between maintenance and operations. None of these improvements can occur if employees believe that once the project is complete, change is finished.

An improvement culture depends heavily on psychological safety and trust. Employees must feel comfortable identifying inefficiencies without fear of criticism. Operational teams often possess the best understanding of where unnecessary work exists because they experience it every day. Effective leaders encourage this feedback, recognising that frontline workers are experts in operational reality.

Continuous improvement also requires governance. Improvement requests should be assessed against business priorities rather than individual preferences. Without governance, organisations often drift back toward customised solutions, inconsistent work practices, and local optimisation, which eventually erode enterprise consistency.

From an OCM perspective, continuous improvement reinforces ownership. The business becomes responsible for improving its operating model rather than relying on the project team or software vendor to solve operational problems. Improvement becomes everyone's responsibility from executives reviewing strategic outcomes through to technicians suggesting better inspection methods.

Ultimately, organisations that continuously improve become more adaptive. They respond faster to changing operational demands, emerging technologies and evolving asset strategies. More importantly, they build employees' confidence that change is not imposed upon them but something they actively shape.

Continuous learning

Learning does not end with training courses or system certification. Continuous learning recognises that capability develops through experience, coaching, reflection and adaptation over time. Organisational Change Management seeks to build organisations that learn continuously rather than simply complete training milestones.

During an EAM implementation, employees acquire new technical skills, but after go-live they begin learning how to integrate those skills into everyday decision-making. They discover more efficient ways to schedule maintenance, manage work orders, improve data quality and collaborate across functional boundaries. These lessons are often far more valuable than classroom training because they emerge from real operational experience.

Continuous learning also supports behavioural change. New habits require reinforcement over months, not days. Leaders play a significant role by encouraging discussion, reviewing lessons learned, recognising good practice and allowing people to experiment with better ways of working.

Technology continually evolves. New software releases introduce additional capabilities, while organisations discover functions that were initially overlooked. Without ongoing learning, employees often continue using only a fraction of the system's capabilities despite significant investment.

Learning should also occur across organisational boundaries. Maintenance teams can learn from operations, planners from reliability engineers, field crews from asset managers and vice versa. Communities of practice, knowledge-sharing forums and cross-functional workshops help prevent valuable operational knowledge from remaining isolated within teams.

An organisation committed to continuous learning demonstrates curiosity rather than compliance. Mistakes become opportunities for learning rather than opportunities for assigning blame. Questions are encouraged, feedback is valued, and improvement becomes part of everyday conversations.

The result is an organisation that continually strengthens its capability, adapts more effectively to change and becomes increasingly confident in both its people and its systems.

System optimisation

Many organisations spend considerable effort implementing an EAM system but relatively little effort optimising it once operational. System optimisation is not simply a technical exercise undertaken by system administrators. It is a collaborative business activity focused on ensuring technology continues to support evolving operational needs.

From an OCM perspective, optimisation begins with understanding how people actually use the system rather than how it was originally designed. Users often develop shortcuts, workarounds or alternative processes that reveal either opportunities for improvement or gaps in system configuration. Listening to users becomes one of the most valuable sources of optimisation ideas.

Optimisation should examine workflows, approvals, reporting, dashboards, mobile capability, integrations, automation and user experience. However, every proposed improvement should first answer a simple question: does this improve business performance or merely make the software different?

Leadership plays an important role by resisting unnecessary customisation while supporting improvements that simplify work, reduce risk or improve decision-making. Optimisation should reinforce standardisation rather than allowing business units to drift toward unique local practices that increase complexity and support costs.

Good governance ensures optimisation decisions balance operational efficiency, long-term maintainability and enterprise consistency. Change requests should consider impacts on training, procedures, support documentation and user adoption rather than focusing solely on technical feasibility.

Importantly, optimisation also involves retiring unnecessary reports, removing redundant workflows and simplifying overly complicated processes. Sometimes the best optimisation is making the system easier to use rather than adding more functionality.

Successful organisations view their EAM platform as an evolving business capability rather than a finished technology project. System optimisation therefore becomes a continuous partnership between business, technology and leadership.

Capability uplift

Capability uplift is about developing the organisation's ability to perform better, not simply increasing software knowledge. While training introduces employees to new systems, capability uplift builds the confidence, judgement and behaviours required to operate effectively in the future business environment.

OCM recognises that capability exists across multiple dimensions. Individuals require technical competence, but they also need decision-making skills, collaboration, problem-solving, data literacy and an understanding of how their work contributes to broader organisational outcomes.

Capability uplift occurs progressively. Coaching, mentoring, operational support, peer learning and practical experience all contribute to sustained improvement. Employees become increasingly capable as they apply new knowledge within real operational situations.

Leaders also require capability uplift. They must learn how to lead through change, coach new behaviours, interpret performance data, manage resistance and reinforce desired ways of working. Without capable leaders, frontline capability improvements rarely become sustainable.

Capability uplift extends to entire teams. Cross-functional collaboration between maintenance, operations, engineering, planning and supply chain becomes increasingly important as organisations adopt integrated EAM processes. Teams must understand not only their own responsibilities but also how their decisions affect others.

An organisation that continually invests in capability becomes more resilient. It responds more effectively to workforce turnover, technological advancement and changing operational requirements because knowledge is continually refreshed rather than concentrated within a few experienced individuals.

Ultimately, capability uplift strengthens organisational confidence. Employees become more willing to embrace change because they trust their ability to succeed within it.

Governance evolution

Governance should never remain static after an EAM implementation. As organisations mature, governance must evolve alongside business capability, technology and operational complexity. Organisational Change Management helps ensure governance remains relevant rather than becoming an administrative burden.

Early governance often focuses on project delivery, risk management and implementation decisions. After go-live, governance shifts toward operational ownership, continuous improvement, data quality, performance measurement and strategic decision-making.

The evolution of governance also reflects growing organisational maturity. Decision-making gradually shifts closer to operational teams as capabilities increase, while executives focus more on strategic direction, investment priorities and organisational performance.

Strong governance maintains alignment between people, processes and technology. It ensures that system changes support the business strategy, that operational improvements remain consistent across the enterprise, and that asset information remains trusted.

Leadership behaviours are central to effective governance. Governance frameworks only succeed when leaders actively participate, make timely decisions and consistently reinforce agreed standards. If leaders bypass governance processes, others will quickly follow.

Governance should remain practical rather than bureaucratic. Meetings should enable decisions rather than report status. Performance reviews should drive improvement rather than assign blame. Policies should guide behaviour rather than restrict innovation.

As organisations become more mature, governance increasingly becomes an enabler of agility. Clear decision rights, trusted information and effective leadership allow organisations to respond quickly while maintaining enterprise consistency.

Organisational Maturity

Organisational maturity reflects an organisation's ability to consistently achieve desired outcomes through aligned people, processes, technology, leadership and culture. It is not measured by software sophistication but by the consistency with which the organisation operates.

OCM focuses on building maturity gradually. Organisations typically progress from reactive behaviour toward increasingly proactive, collaborative and data-informed ways of working. Each stage requires behavioural change as much as process improvement.

Mature organisations demonstrate high levels of trust. Employees understand their responsibilities, leaders empower decision-making and cross-functional collaboration becomes routine rather than exceptional. Information flows more freely because confidence exists in both the data and the people using it.

Leadership maturity also develops over time. Leaders transition from directing activity toward enabling capability. Rather than solving every operational issue themselves, they develop others to identify problems, implement improvements and make informed decisions.

Organisational maturity also requires consistency. Standard processes are followed not because compliance demands it, but because employees recognise their value in improving safety, efficiency and reliability. Flexibility exists where appropriate, but not at the expense of enterprise alignment.

Continuous improvement becomes embedded within organisational culture. Employees naturally seek better ways of working, and governance provides mechanisms to evaluate and implement worthwhile improvements.

Ultimately, mature organisations adapt more successfully because change becomes part of normal business rather than a disruptive event requiring extraordinary effort.

Asset Management Maturity

Beyond the project's end, Asset Management maturity extends beyond the effective maintenance of physical assets. It reflects how well the organisation integrates strategy, planning, operations, maintenance, engineering, finance and information to optimise asset performance across the entire lifecycle.

An EAM system provides enabling technology, but maturity comes from the behaviours surrounding its use. High-quality asset information only creates value when people trust it, maintain it and use it to make better decisions.

OCM supports Asset Management maturity by helping people understand why consistent asset information, disciplined work management and standard processes matter. Employees are more likely to adopt new practices when they understand how these contribute to improved reliability, reduced risk and better service outcomes.

Leadership alignment is essential. Executives, asset managers and operational leaders must communicate consistent expectations regarding planning discipline, data quality, preventive maintenance and lifecycle decision-making. Mixed messages quickly undermine maturity.

As maturity increases, organisations shift from reactive maintenance toward proactive and predictive approaches. Decisions increasingly rely on evidence rather than intuition. Collaboration improves between engineering, operations, maintenance and finance because everyone shares a common understanding of asset objectives.

Asset Management maturity is also reflected in governance. Asset strategies are regularly reviewed, performance measures evolve, investment decisions become increasingly risk-based and continuous improvement becomes integrated into everyday operations.

The journey toward maturity never truly ends. New technologies, changing regulatory environments and evolving organisational priorities continually present opportunities to strengthen Asset Management capability.

Adoption

Adoption is often misunderstood as system usage. Logging into an EAM system or completing work orders electronically does not necessarily mean employees have adopted new ways of working. True adoption occurs when people willingly integrate new behaviours into their daily work because they believe those behaviours improve outcomes.

From an OCM perspective, adoption is the bridge between implementation and value realisation. Without adoption, even the most sophisticated technology delivers limited

business benefit. Sustainable adoption depends upon trust, leadership, capability, communication and organisational alignment.

Employees adopt change when they understand its purpose, possess the necessary skills and observe leaders consistently reinforcing expected behaviours. Conflicting messages or inconsistent leadership rapidly erode adoption because employees naturally revert to familiar practices.

Adoption also requires removing barriers. Poor data quality, overly complex workflows, insufficient support or unclear processes discourage employees from embracing new ways of working. Continuous feedback allows these barriers to be identified and resolved quickly.

Measurement plays an important role. Organisations should monitor behavioural indicators such as planning compliance, preventive maintenance completion, data quality, collaboration, workflow consistency, and decision-making, rather than relying solely on system logins or transaction volumes.

Perhaps most importantly, adoption is not permanent. Without reinforcement, organisations gradually return to old habits. Leadership routines, governance, coaching, continuous learning and recognition all help sustain desired behaviours over time.

Successful adoption ultimately reflects organisational confidence. People trust the system, trust the processes, trust their leaders and trust one another. At that point, the EAM system is no longer viewed as "the new system"; it simply becomes the way the organisation manages its assets and delivers value.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Continuous improvement is sustained through curiosity rather than complacency.	Every improvement should be assessed for operational, safety and compliance impacts before implementation.
Organisations mature when employees actively seek better ways of working.	Incremental changes should follow the same governance principles as major changes.
Adoption should continue to be measured long after project completion.	Continuous improvement should preserve configuration integrity across systems and assets.
Learning from operational experience strengthens both people and processes.	Approved improvements should be documented to maintain traceability and accountability.
Mature organisations encourage experimentation while maintaining organisational discipline.	Operational performance should be monitored to confirm that improvements deliver the intended outcomes.
Continuous improvement becomes part of organisational culture when everyone feels responsible for making work better.	Sustainable improvement balances innovation with disciplined operational governance.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Depart
Also Supports	Discover
Why it matters	Continuous improvement creates the next cycle of organisational learning and future change.

One of the most valuable lessons I've learnt is that transformation should never really end. Every implementation uncovers opportunities that couldn't have been anticipated during the design phase. The organisations that gain the greatest long-term value are those that continue to learn, refine governance, improve information quality and strengthen operational capability long after the project closes.

Continuous improvement isn't another initiative; it's evidence that the organisation has matured beyond implementing change to actively managing it (Peter).

Chapter 27 - When EAM Becomes Business as Usual

One of the greatest mistakes in Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) programs is assuming success occurs at go-live. Go-live is not the destination; it is simply the point where responsibility begins to transition from the project team to the operational business. From an Organisational Change Management (OCM) perspective, the real measure of success is when people stop referring to "the new system" and say, "this is how we work."

Business as Usual (BAU) is achieved when new processes, behaviours, and decision-making practices are embedded in everyday operations. The EAM platform no longer feels like a project deliverable but has become an invisible part of how work is planned, executed, monitored, and improved. Conversations move away from learning the software towards improving maintenance performance, reducing risk, increasing reliability and making better business decisions.

This transition rarely happens automatically. People naturally gravitate towards familiar habits, especially when operational pressures increase. Without deliberate reinforcement, many organisations slowly recreate old ways of working using new technology. Work requests become phone calls again. Planning meetings disappear. Preventive maintenance is bypassed. Spreadsheets return. Local workarounds emerge. Eventually, the organisation has an expensive EAM system supporting yesterday's behaviours.

OCM focuses on preventing this regression. It recognises that embedding change requires ongoing leadership, governance, coaching, measurement and reinforcement long after implementation teams have departed. The transition to BAU should be planned as carefully as the implementation itself.

Successful organisations gradually shift ownership of the project from the project team to operational leadership. Managers begin using EAM information during routine

planning meetings. Supervisors coach people on process compliance rather than simply completing work orders. Continuous improvement replaces project governance, and operational performance becomes the focus instead of system functionality.

Ultimately, Business as Usual is achieved when the organisation no longer needs reminders to use the EAM system correctly because the desired behaviours have become part of the organisational culture. Technology has become another tool supporting effective asset management rather than being the centre of attention.

Operational ownership

Every successful EAM implementation eventually reaches a point where the project team must let go. If operational leaders are not ready to take ownership, the implementation never truly finishes. Instead, the project becomes a permanent support function while the business waits for someone else to solve operational problems.

Operational ownership means that frontline leaders, planners, supervisors and maintenance managers accept responsibility for how the EAM system is used to manage work. The project team may have configured the software, but only operations can determine whether planning disciplines are followed, work quality improves and asset information remains accurate.

From an OCM perspective, ownership is created rather than assigned. Simply telling managers they now "own the system" does not make them accountable. They require capability, confidence, authority and support to lead new ways of working.

- Operational ownership is demonstrated through everyday behaviours.
- Managers review work backlogs using the EAM system rather than requesting spreadsheets.
- Supervisors insist that work orders are completed correctly before jobs are closed.
- Maintenance planners protect planning discipline despite operational pressure.
- Reliability engineers trust system data because they know operational teams maintain it.
- Leadership discussions become centred on operational performance rather than software issues.

Importantly, operational ownership also means accepting responsibility for continuous improvement. The business no longer waits for IT or the system integrator to identify enhancements. Instead, operational teams actively seek opportunities to improve processes, simplify workflows and increase value from the platform.

When operations genuinely own the system, EAM becomes an operational management tool rather than an IT application.

Business ownership

There is an important distinction between operational ownership and business ownership. Operational ownership focuses on using the system effectively every day.

Business ownership is broader. It recognises that EAM supports organisational objectives rather than existing as an isolated technology platform.

Business ownership means senior leaders recognise that the EAM system is part of how the organisation manages its assets, risk, expenditure, compliance and service delivery. It is not "the maintenance system." It is part of the business operating model.

Too many organisations unintentionally hand ownership to IT because IT manages the infrastructure. Others leave ownership with the project office because the implementation never fully transitions into operations. Neither approach embeds organisational change.

Effective business ownership establishes clear accountability across multiple functions.

- Operations own work execution.
- Asset Management owns policy and standards.
- Finance owns financial integration.
- Supply Chain owns inventory processes.
- IT owns technical support.
- Executive leadership owns strategic outcomes.

Each function understands its role while recognising shared responsibility for overall business performance.

From an OCM perspective, this clarity removes one of the biggest causes of post-implementation frustration: uncertainty about who makes decisions. Governance evolves from project steering committees into operational governance forums where decisions are made based on business value rather than project milestones.

Business ownership also changes organisational language. Conversations shift from software releases to reliability improvements, asset risk, workforce productivity, compliance, and customer outcomes. Technology becomes part of how the organisation delivers value.

Technology as an enabler

Many organisations unintentionally place technology at the centre of transformation. The software becomes the project, while people adapt around it. Organisational Change Management deliberately reverses this thinking.

Technology does not improve asset management.

People using better processes, supported by appropriate technology, improve asset management.

An EAM system is therefore an enabler rather than the solution itself.

This distinction fundamentally changes implementation behaviour. Rather than asking what the software can do, organisations begin asking what business capability they are trying to create. The software then becomes one component supporting that capability.

- Technology enables better planning.
- It enables improved visibility.
- It enables standardisation.
- It enables data-driven decision-making.
- It enables governance.
- It enables collaboration across departments.

However, technology cannot create accountability, leadership, trust, collaboration or organisational discipline. These remain human capabilities requiring deliberate organisational effort.

One of the clearest signs that an organisation has matured is when conversations no longer revolve around software features. Instead, people discuss business outcomes. The EAM system quietly supports these conversations in the background by providing reliable information and structured processes.

The best technology implementations eventually become almost invisible. People use them because they help them perform their work more effectively.

From an OCM perspective, success occurs when technology fades into the background while business capability moves into the foreground.

Sustainable capability

The final objective of Organisational Change Management is not successful implementation; it is sustainable capability.

Capability extends well beyond system knowledge. It is the organisation's ongoing ability to consistently perform asset management activities regardless of staff turnover, organisational restructuring or future technology upgrades.

Sustainable capability combines several elements:

- People possess the knowledge and confidence to perform their roles.
- Leaders actively reinforce expected behaviours.
- Business processes remain consistent.
- Governance continues after project closure.
- Training becomes part of organisational onboarding.
- Knowledge is documented rather than residing with individuals.
- Continuous improvement becomes part of operational culture.
- The organisation invests in capability long after implementation funding ends.

One of the greatest risks following implementation is capability erosion. Experienced project team members leave. Contractors finish their engagements. Subject matter experts move to new roles. Without deliberate knowledge transfer, organisational capability slowly declines until the business begins repeating old mistakes.

OCM therefore treats capability as an ongoing organisational investment rather than a one-off training exercise. Refresher learning, coaching, communities of practice, mentoring, performance support and continuous improvement all contribute to maintaining capability over time.

Sustainable capability also creates resilience. New employees can quickly become productive. Leaders understand their governance responsibilities. Process improvements continue. Data quality remains high. Technology upgrades become easier because the underlying business capability already exists.

Ultimately, organisations achieve the greatest return on their EAM investment not because they implemented excellent software, but because they built an organisation capable of continually improving its asset management. That is when the implementation truly becomes Business as Usual.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Business ownership begins when the project team steps away.	Operational ownership includes responsibility for managing future changes under established governance.
Technology should become almost invisible as people focus on managing assets rather than systems.	Governance should transition seamlessly from project structures to operational management.
Sustainable capability depends on continuous coaching and leadership support.	Operational procedures should be regularly reviewed to ensure they remain current and effective.
Continuous learning prevents organisations from slipping back into old habits.	Approved processes should evolve through controlled improvement rather than informal workarounds.
The true measure of success is that new employees learn the current way of working.	Asset information, processes, and responsibilities should remain under control as operational maturity develops.
Business-as-usual is achieved when improvement becomes part of everyday operations rather than a special initiative.	Operational governance should continue to support safe, reliable and compliant asset management beyond the project lifecycle.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Depart
Also Supports	Deliver
Why it matters	Ownership transitions from project teams to operational leadership, ensuring sustained value from the EAM capability.

One of the greatest satisfactions of my career has been returning to organisations years after implementation and finding that the new ways of working have become the norm. That's when I know the project delivered more than software; it helped build organisational capability.

I've learnt that continuous improvement is ultimately about creating a culture where people feel empowered to keep making things better long after the consultants have left. (Martin)

For me, the real measure of success is the day people stop talking about the project altogether. The system becomes how work is performed.

Governance is embedded in everyday practice, supported by clear documentation, established accountabilities and ongoing knowledge transfer. Decisions are made confidently using trusted information, issues are resolved through agreed governance processes, and new employees learn the established way of working without relying on stories about "how we used to do it."

Operational ownership transfers when named operational functions are ready to run the system, processes, controls and support arrangements without project dependency. Business ownership transfers when named leaders accept accountability for outcomes, benefits, priorities and future decisions.

These transfers may occur at different times, but both must be explicit before project closure.

That is when Enterprise Asset Management has genuinely become Business as Usual, not because the project ended, but because the organisation evolved. (Peter)

Part Nine - Advanced Topics

Chapter 28 - Organisational Design for EAM

One of the greatest misconceptions in Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementations is that introducing a new system somehow creates a new organisation. It does not. Technology can support an organisational design, but it cannot compensate for a poorly defined one. Organisational Change Management (OCM) must therefore help organisations determine not simply how the software will work, but how people, teams and leadership will work together once the technology is in place.

Organisation design becomes particularly important because EAM rarely belongs to a single department. It spans engineering, operations, maintenance, supply chain, finance, projects, IT, and executive leadership. Every organisational structure creates different strengths and different risks.

In a functional organisation, departments operate largely independently. Maintenance reports to Maintenance, Operations to Operations and Engineering to Engineering. While this structure provides clear accountability within each function, it often prioritises departmental optimisation over asset optimisation. Maintenance may pursue equipment reliability while Operations prioritises production output, creating competing objectives. OCM focuses on creating shared ownership and cross-functional behaviours that overcome organisational boundaries.

A matrix organisation introduces shared accountability. Individuals may report functionally to one manager while working operationally for another. This can improve collaboration but also creates confusion around priorities, authority and decision-making if governance is unclear. Successful OCM ensures employees understand not

only who they report to, but who owns decisions, approves work, manages priorities and resolves conflicts.

A project-based organisation introduces another dynamic. During implementation, project teams often become the centre of decision-making. The risk is that the business becomes disconnected from decisions being made on its behalf. OCM continually shifts ownership back toward operational leaders so the future operating model belongs to the business rather than the implementation project.

An asset-centric organisation looks beyond organisational charts altogether. Instead of optimising departments, it organises decisions around the lifecycle and performance of assets. Maintenance planners, reliability engineers, operations, finance and supply chain work collectively toward asset outcomes rather than departmental metrics. This represents the maturity that many EAM implementations aspire to achieve.

Ultimately, organisational design is less about reporting lines than it is about enabling collaboration. An effective EAM implementation deliberately designs governance, behaviours, accountability and decision-making so that the organisation works together to improve asset performance rather than simply deploying another piece of software.

Operating models

An operating model defines how an organisation delivers value. While organisation charts describe who reports to whom, the operating model explains how work actually gets done. From an OCM perspective, changing the operating model is often far more significant than changing the technology itself.

Many organisations discover that their existing operating model evolved over decades. Processes differ between sites, planning approaches vary between business units, and local workarounds have become accepted practice. Implementing an EAM often exposes these inconsistencies because the software requires common processes and consistent governance.

Functional operating models typically centralise expertise within departments. Maintenance, procurement and engineering each optimise their own activities. While this can produce strong technical capability, it often creates fragmented asset decisions.

Matrix operating models encourage collaboration across functions. Planners work with Operations, Reliability supports Maintenance, and Finance participates in investment decisions. However, collaboration only succeeds when roles and decision rights are clearly understood. Without this clarity, employees experience duplicate approvals, conflicting priorities, and uncertainty about accountability.

Project operating models provide speed during implementation but should never become permanent. Projects exist to deliver change; operations exist to sustain value. OCM helps organisations transition from temporary project governance to sustainable business governance before implementation teams disband.

Asset-centric operating models organise activities around asset performance rather than organisational boundaries. Planning, scheduling, maintenance execution, engineering, procurement and capital planning all contribute toward common asset objectives. Performance measures become enterprise outcomes rather than departmental outputs.

Designing the future operating model requires organisations to ask difficult questions. Which decisions should be centralised? Which remain local? Where should specialist expertise reside? Which roles need new capabilities? These questions cannot be answered solely by software vendors. They require organisational leaders who understand both business strategy and operational reality.

The most successful operating models balance consistency with flexibility. Standardisation provides efficiency, while appropriate local autonomy allows sites to respond to unique operational conditions without compromising enterprise governance.

Centres of Excellence

Many organisations establish a Centre of Excellence (CoE) during an EAM implementation, but far fewer define what excellence actually means. A Centre of Excellence is not another management layer. It exists to provide governance, expertise, standards and continuous improvement across the organisation.

From an OCM perspective, a CoE becomes the guardian of sustainable change after project completion. Rather than allowing every site to modify processes independently, the CoE maintains consistency while supporting innovation.

In functional organisations, a CoE often provides specialist knowledge to departments without directly managing operational teams. Engineering standards, maintenance strategies, asset information standards and reporting frameworks are developed centrally while execution remains within operational functions.

Within matrix organisations, the CoE becomes an important coordinating mechanism. Specialists may report to different business units but align through common methodologies, communities of practice and enterprise governance. This allows expertise to be shared across organisational boundaries.

Project organisations frequently create temporary Centres of Excellence during implementation. The challenge is ensuring they survive beyond go-live. If the CoE disappears with the project team, organisations often drift back toward inconsistent practices and fragmented governance.

Asset-centric organisations derive enormous value from permanent Centres of Excellence because they maintain enterprise-wide thinking around reliability, asset strategy, master data, planning methodologies and continuous improvement. Rather than controlling local operations, they enable them with better standards, coaching and capability.

An effective CoE balances governance with service. It should not become a bureaucratic approval body disconnected from operations. Instead, it should provide

practical guidance, facilitate collaboration between sites, monitor organisational maturity and identify opportunities for continuous improvement.

OCM also plays a significant role in ensuring the CoE is viewed as a trusted partner rather than a compliance function. Relationships, credibility and operational understanding determine whether people seek advice voluntarily or comply because they have to.

Regional versus local governance

Large organisations often struggle to balance enterprise consistency with local operational flexibility. Every site believes its circumstances are unique, while corporate leadership seeks standardisation. OCM helps organisations navigate this tension without creating unnecessary conflict.

Regional governance provides consistency across multiple sites. Policies, asset standards, reporting, maintenance strategies and performance measures become aligned. This creates economies of scale, improves benchmarking and simplifies training, technology support and continuous improvement.

However, excessive centralisation can lead to frustration when local teams lose the ability to respond quickly to operational realities. Different climates, regulatory environments, asset types and workforce capabilities may require appropriate local variation.

Functional organisations often rely heavily on local governance because departmental leaders make decisions independently. While this encourages ownership, it can also result in multiple versions of the same process, inconsistent asset data and duplicated effort.

Matrix organisations typically combine regional governance with local operational authority. Enterprise standards define minimum expectations while local leaders retain flexibility within agreed boundaries. Success depends upon clearly defining which decisions are mandatory and which are discretionary.

Project organisations commonly introduce highly centralised governance during implementation. While necessary for delivery, governance should gradually transition toward operational leadership rather than remaining project-centric indefinitely.

Asset-centric organisations focus governance on asset outcomes rather than organisational politics. Decisions are assessed based on their impact on safety, reliability, lifecycle cost, and business performance, rather than on whether they originate from the head office or a regional site.

OCM supports this balance by creating transparency around decision rights, explaining the rationale for standardisation, and engaging local stakeholders in the design of enterprise standards. When people understand why consistency matters and where flexibility is appropriate, they are far more likely to support governance rather than resist it.

Ultimately, governance should provide enough consistency to improve enterprise performance while preserving sufficient local autonomy to allow operational excellence.

Federated organisations

Federated organisations present one of the most complex environments for Enterprise Asset Management. Business units often operate semi-independently, with their own leadership, budgets, priorities, systems, and cultures, while remaining part of a larger enterprise.

From an OCM perspective, federated organisations require influence rather than control. Success depends less on issuing directives and more on building alignment, trust and shared purpose across autonomous business units.

Functional federated organisations frequently maintain separate maintenance departments, engineering teams and operational processes. Each business unit may have developed practices optimised for its own environment. Imposing enterprise-wide change without consultation often creates significant resistance.

Matrix structures can help federated organisations by creating enterprise communities across business units. Reliability engineers, planners, asset managers and maintenance leaders collaborate despite belonging to different organisational entities. These networks become powerful mechanisms for knowledge sharing and organisational learning.

Project organisations often struggle because implementation teams assume decisions made centrally will automatically be adopted locally. Federated businesses frequently require extensive engagement, negotiation and adaptation to secure commitment from individual business units.

An asset-centric approach provides perhaps the strongest unifying principle. Regardless of organisational differences, every business unit seeks safe, reliable, compliant and cost-effective asset performance. OCM uses these common objectives to create alignment without removing local ownership.

Successful federated governance clearly distinguishes enterprise standards from local implementation. Core asset information, maintenance frameworks, risk methodologies and reporting structures may be standardised, while operational execution reflects local conditions. This creates consistency where it matters most without unnecessarily restricting operational effectiveness.

Ultimately, federated organisations succeed when they stop viewing standardisation as a loss of autonomy and begin to see it as a mechanism for sharing knowledge, reducing duplication, and improving enterprise asset performance. OCM enables this shift by creating shared ownership of the future rather than imposing change from the centre.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations

Organisational structures should support the asset lifecycle rather than reinforce functional silos.	Governance responsibilities should be clearly allocated across organisational structures.
Centres of Excellence should enable consistency without reducing local ownership.	Federated organisations require clearly defined approval authorities and decision rights.
Matrix organisations rely more on collaboration than on hierarchy.	Regional variations should remain within approved governance frameworks.
Organisational design should encourage shared accountability for asset performance.	Operational accountability should remain clear regardless of organisational complexity.
Future structures should improve decision-making rather than redistribute reporting lines.	Governance should ensure consistent operational standards across all business units.
Organisational design succeeds when people understand both their own role and how it contributes to organisational value.	Changes to organisational responsibilities should be formally managed to preserve operational continuity.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Design
Also Supports	Depart
Why it matters	Organisational structures and governance should support both implementation and long-term operational excellence.

I have never believed organisational structure alone determines success. What matters is how responsibilities connect.

Different structures can achieve similar outcomes when decision rights are clear, information ownership is defined, operational accountability is visible, and exceptions are governed consistently.

Good organisational design shows where responsibility begins, where it transfers and who has authority when normal arrangements no longer apply.

Structure provides clarity, but governance provides confidence. (Peter)

Chapter 29 - Managing Multiple Change Programs

Few organisations undertake an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementation in isolation. More commonly, the EAM program is delivered alongside ERP upgrades, cybersecurity initiatives, digital engineering projects, data programs, operating model reviews, organisational restructures, capital works, regulatory reforms, and cost-reduction initiatives. While each program may have its own business case, governance structure and delivery team, employees experience them as one combined organisational journey.

This is where Organisational Change Management (OCM) moves beyond supporting a single project and begins managing enterprise-wide change. People do not distinguish between Project A and Project B. They know that another system is changing, another process is being redesigned, another workshop has been scheduled, or another training course has been added to their calendar. If every project competes for attention independently, the organisation quickly becomes overwhelmed.

Effective OCM therefore requires visibility across the entire change portfolio rather than focusing solely on the implementation of one solution.

Some of the principles include:

- Treat change as an enterprise capability rather than a project activity. Individual projects deliver solutions, but OCM helps the organisation absorb multiple changes in a coordinated manner.
- Understand cumulative impact. Five small initiatives delivered simultaneously often create greater disruption than one major transformation.
- Coordinate engagement activities. Workshops, surveys, communications and training should be planned across programs to minimise operational disruption.
- Look beyond project schedules. Just because multiple projects can technically deliver at the same time does not mean the business can successfully adopt them all.
- Consider operational cycles. Shutdowns, seasonal workloads, budgeting periods and major maintenance campaigns all influence the organisation's capacity to change.
- Recognise shared stakeholders. Operations managers, planners, supervisors and frontline teams are frequently involved in numerous projects simultaneously.
- Measure organisational capacity. The ability to absorb change should become an organisational metric rather than an assumption.

One of the greatest mistakes organisations make is believing that every project has the highest priority. From an executive perspective, this may appear true, but at the operational level, competing priorities create confusion. Employees are forced to decide which meetings to attend, which processes to follow and which initiative deserves their attention today. OCM provides mechanisms to resolve these conflicts before they lead to frustration and resistance.

Ultimately, successful organisations do not simply manage projects well. They manage the experience of change across all projects, ensuring people remain capable, engaged and confident despite an increasingly complex transformation landscape.

Portfolio governance

Traditional project governance focuses on scope, schedule, cost and risk within a single initiative. Portfolio governance expands this perspective by asking a much broader question: How do all these initiatives affect the organisation as a whole?

For OCM practitioners, portfolio governance provides the mechanism for coordinating change across multiple projects rather than allowing each project to operate independently. Without it, organisations often see duplicated communications, conflicting priorities, repeated requests for business resources and inconsistent leadership messaging.

Portfolio governance should provide visibility across:

- The timing of major business changes
- Shared business stakeholders
- Resource availability
- Training requirements
- Communication schedules
- Business readiness
- Organisational capacity
- Enterprise risks

Within an EAM implementation, portfolio governance becomes particularly important because many supporting projects contribute to the final solution. Data migration, infrastructure upgrades, cybersecurity improvements, mobile technology, GIS integration, finance integration and reporting initiatives may all have separate project managers but collectively influence the same end users.

An effective portfolio governance forum asks questions that individual project boards often overlook:

- Which business areas are experiencing the greatest concentration of change?
- Are multiple projects requesting the same SMEs?
- Are different projects communicating conflicting messages?
- Is operational leadership becoming overloaded?
- Can go-live dates realistically coexist?
- Is the organisation capable of absorbing everything currently planned?

OCM provides valuable evidence into these discussions through readiness assessments, stakeholder feedback, adoption measures and change impact assessments.

Portfolio governance should also establish common standards. Rather than each project inventing its own communication approach, stakeholder analysis or readiness assessment, enterprise standards improve consistency while reducing duplication.

Most importantly, portfolio governance shifts decision-making from project optimisation to organisational optimisation. A project may be technically ready to deploy, but if the business is already navigating several other significant changes, delaying implementation may ultimately improve enterprise outcomes.

Effective portfolio governance protects both project success and organisational wellbeing.

Programme interaction

Projects rarely operate independently. Every initiative influences, supports or competes with others in ways that are often underestimated during planning.

An EAM implementation provides a good example. Success may depend upon:

- ERP upgrades
- Asset data improvement
- Identity management
- GIS enhancements
- Mobility projects
- Reporting platforms
- Digital engineering initiatives
- Asset management framework development
- Operating model redesign

Each project has dependencies that extend well beyond technology. They share business experts, operational leaders, governance forums, communication channels and training audiences.

OCM plays an important role in understanding these interactions because organisational impacts often emerge where projects overlap rather than where they operate independently.

Positive programme interaction occurs when projects reinforce one another. For example, an operating model review may introduce centralised maintenance planning while the EAM implementation delivers planning functionality that supports the new process. Together they strengthen adoption because organisational design and technology evolve simultaneously.

Negative interactions occur when initiatives compete.

Examples include:

- Two projects redesigning the same business process.
- Different projects requesting identical SMEs at the same time.
- Competing leadership messages.
- Multiple technology changes affecting the same users.
- Training programs delivered simultaneously.
- Different projects defining different versions of future roles.

Without coordination, employees become unsure which initiative to support first.

Programme interaction should therefore be actively managed through integrated planning, shared governance and collaborative delivery teams. OCM practitioners are uniquely positioned to identify overlaps because they maintain relationships across business units rather than focusing solely on technical deliverables.

Another important consideration is sequencing. Some behavioural changes naturally prepare the organisation for future initiatives. Others should deliberately follow

successful adoption of earlier programs rather than introducing multiple fundamental changes simultaneously.

When programme interactions are managed well, individual initiatives strengthen one another. When ignored, even well-managed projects can collectively create confusion, frustration and declining organisational confidence.

Competing priorities

One of the greatest challenges facing organisational change is not resistance to a single initiative; it is competing priorities created by many worthwhile initiatives occurring at the same time.

Every project has legitimate objectives. Every executive sponsor believes their initiative is strategically important. Every delivery team works towards committed milestones. Yet the people expected to adopt these changes have limited time, attention and capacity.

OCM recognises that people cannot successfully prioritise ten critical initiatives simultaneously.

Operational managers experience competing priorities daily:

- Attend project workshops or manage operational issues?
- Complete training or respond to customer demands?
- Participate in testing or supervise maintenance work?
- Improve data quality or complete urgent repairs?
- Support change activities or meet production targets?

These are rarely poor decisions; they are genuine operational trade-offs.

Effective OCM helps leadership understand that organisational capacity is finite. Rather than asking people to "work harder", successful organisations consciously prioritise what matters most at any point in time.

Strategies include:

- Establishing enterprise priorities through executive governance.
- Deferring lower-value initiatives.
- Combining engagement activities across projects.
- Coordinating business resource requests.
- Protecting operational periods of peak workload.
- Providing managers with clear guidance on organisational priorities.
- Continuously monitoring business readiness.

Leadership consistency is critical. Employees quickly lose confidence when different executives communicate conflicting priorities. Unified leadership messaging reduces ambiguity and enables local managers to make better operational decisions.

Competing priorities cannot always be eliminated, but they can be managed transparently. OCM helps organisations move from asking individuals to resolve

conflicts themselves toward creating an environment where priorities are clearly understood, coordinated and supported.

Avoiding change fatigue

Change fatigue is not simply a function of the amount of change. It results from people feeling that change is relentless, poorly coordinated, insufficiently supported or unlikely to produce meaningful improvements.

In organisations delivering multiple transformation programs, change fatigue becomes one of the greatest risks to successful EAM implementation. Employees may not resist the EAM solution itself; they may have exhausted their capacity to engage after months or years of continuous organisational disruption.

Signs of change fatigue include:

- Reduced participation in workshops.
- Lower attendance at training.
- Declining survey response rates.
- Increased scepticism towards communications.
- Growing frustration with leadership.
- Delayed decision-making.
- Reduced willingness to volunteer as champions.
- A return to familiar ways of working despite new systems being available.

OCM should treat these behaviours as indicators of organisational overload rather than assuming people are resistant to change.

Preventing change fatigue begins long before implementation. It requires leaders to understand organisational capacity and deliberately pace transformation. This may involve staggering deployments, simplifying communications, combining activities where practical and ensuring employees have adequate time to absorb new ways of working before introducing further change.

Leadership behaviour also plays a significant role. Visible leaders who acknowledge the effort required, celebrate progress, remove unnecessary work and provide consistent direction help maintain trust throughout extended transformation programs. Conversely, leaders who continually launch new initiatives without closing previous ones contribute to fatigue and cynicism.

OCM should also create opportunities for people to experience success. Celebrating milestones, sharing operational improvements, recognising local achievements and demonstrating realised benefits reinforce that the effort invested is producing tangible outcomes.

Ultimately, avoiding change fatigue is not about slowing every project. It is about managing the human capacity for sustained transformation. Organisations that recognise change as a finite resource are far more likely to achieve lasting adoption, maintain employee engagement and realise the full benefits of their investment in Enterprise Asset Management.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Employees experience organisational change as one journey, not a collection of projects.	Multiple operational changes should be coordinated to minimise cumulative operational risk.
Competing priorities can overwhelm even highly capable organisations.	Portfolio governance should identify dependencies and operational impacts that conflict with one another.
Change fatigue is reduced through prioritisation, sequencing and leadership alignment.	Simultaneous operational changes should be assessed for their combined effect on business continuity.
Programme interaction should be actively managed rather than left to individual project teams.	Governance should ensure consistent approval processes across multiple initiatives.
Leaders should present a unified organisational narrative rather than competing project messages.	Resource constraints should be considered when scheduling concurrent operational changes.
Organisational capacity for change is finite and should be managed strategically.	Effective portfolio governance protects operational performance while enabling transformation.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Deliver
Also Supports	Discover, Define, Design, Depart
Why it matters	Portfolio-level change coordination spans the entire lifecycle and ensures competing initiatives work together rather than against each other.

One of the biggest challenges I have encountered is not managing a single transformation, but helping organisations cope with many changes at once.

Projects often compete for the same leaders, subject-matter experts, and operational teams. From a Management of Change perspective, the organisation has one finite capacity for change. Dependencies, sequencing and protection of operational capability are therefore as important as delivery.

When an operating model changes after the Define phase, plans must adapt without losing strategic direction. Sometimes the right decision is not to accelerate another initiative, but to allow the organisation time to absorb the changes already underway.

My guiding principle is: write the strategy in stone and the plans in sand. (Peter)

When multiple programmes of change are underway, people often feel overwhelmed. If OCM and MoC are integrated through frameworks such as the Structured Change Framework (SCF), people begin to see the woods through the trees and move from

being overwhelmed to understanding their role and placement within the change itself. (Martin)

Chapter 30 - Lessons Learnt (and earned)

One of the greatest misconceptions about experience is that it is simply a collection of lessons learned after the fact. In reality, the value of experience lies not in remembering what happened, but in recognising familiar patterns as they emerge and having the confidence to respond differently. Throughout our careers, we have discovered that successful change practitioners are constantly learning in the moment. They observe, listen, adapt and adjust long before a project reaches its conclusion. Every conversation, workshop, risk assessment, leadership meeting or operational challenge presents an opportunity to refine the approach. In many cases, the most important lessons are not documented in project closure reports; they are applied immediately to keep the organisation moving forward.

The following reflections are drawn from decades of implementing Enterprise Asset Management systems, supporting Asset Management capability, and working across both Organisational Change Management (OCM) and the Management of Change (MoC). They are not presented as universal truths or a checklist for success. Rather, they represent recurring patterns that we have encountered across industries, organisations and projects of every size. Sometimes we recognised these patterns early enough to influence the outcome; other times we only appreciated their significance after experiencing the consequences. Either way, every lesson strengthened our understanding of how organisations respond to change.

Perhaps the most important insight is that sustaining change requires continuous learning rather than perfect planning. Organisational Change Management provides the mechanisms for understanding people, behaviours, leadership and organisational readiness, while the Management of Change provides the discipline required to introduce change safely and responsibly. Together, they create an environment where organisations can learn, adapt, and improve throughout the journey, rather than waiting until the end to discover what could have been done differently. In our experience, the organisations that sustain change are not those that avoid mistakes; they are the ones that recognise them quickly, learn from them collectively and confidently adjust their course before those mistakes become embedded in the new way of working.

The following lessons are therefore less about looking backwards and more about building the judgement to move forwards. They are the observations that have shaped our practice, influenced how we work with clients, and, perhaps most importantly, reminded us that both Asset Management and Change Management are continuous disciplines. Every project, every organisation and every conversation presents another opportunity to learn, to improve and to leave the organisation in a better position than we found it.

Technology Never Changes an Organisation, People Do

One of the earliest lessons we learned was that organisations almost always overestimate what technology will fix and underestimate what people must change.

We have seen organisations spend millions implementing sophisticated Enterprise Asset Management systems while assuming that the software itself would improve planning, maintenance, data quality, and decision-making. It never does. Software only enables better practices. People create them.

Too often, the conversation begins with features, functionality, and configuration before anyone has discussed leadership, behaviours, or operational expectations. The project becomes a technology implementation instead of an organisational transformation. Eventually, the business concludes that the software "doesn't work" when, in reality, the organisation never changed the way it worked.

Over time, we changed our own approach. Rather than beginning with the system, we began with the future organisation. We asked different questions. How should maintenance decisions be made? What behaviours are expected from planners? What information should supervisors trust? What decisions belong to operations instead of engineering? Only after defining the desired organisation did we discuss how technology could support it.

This became one of the foundations of both our Organisational Change Management and Management of Change approaches. OCM prepares the organisation to adopt new ways of working. MoC manages the practical transition between operating environments. Together they ensure that technology becomes an enabler rather than the centre of attention.

Today we rarely talk about implementing software. We talk about building organisational capability supported by software. That subtle difference has consistently produced better outcomes.

Resistance is Usually Information, Not Opposition

Early in our careers, we viewed resistance as something to be managed or overcome. Experience taught us something entirely different.

The people who resist change are often the people who understand the operational environment best. Their questions are frequently grounded in practical experience rather than negativity. They know which shortcuts exist, where information is unreliable and what really happens when the ideal process meets operational reality.

When organisations label these people as "resistant", they often lose their most valuable source of organisational intelligence.

We gradually changed the way we approached resistance. Rather than asking why people would not support the project, we asked what they knew that the project did not. Many of the most significant project improvements came directly from frontline operators, planners, schedulers, maintainers and supervisors who challenged proposed solutions.

Management of Change taught us to evaluate operational risk before implementing change. Organisational Change Management taught us to understand the human reasons behind concerns. Together these disciplines transformed resistance into valuable feedback.

Today we encourage project teams to actively seek disagreement early. Healthy challenge almost always costs less than fixing problems after go-live.

I find resistance the best signal to delve into the barriers or constraints causing it. This creates a conversation, and from that conversation, if people can feel heard and listened to, any decision to defer, reject or include an idea will close the loop. (Martin)

Process Maps Rarely Show How Work Really Happens

Almost every project begins with process mapping. Unfortunately, process maps often describe how management believes work occurs rather than how work actually gets done.

Across every industry we have encountered unofficial spreadsheets, whiteboards, notebooks, text messages, radio calls, personal memory and informal conversations that keep operations running. These unofficial practices rarely appear in documented procedures, yet they often determine whether work succeeds or fails.

Ignoring these realities results in poor system design, as the new solution replaces documented processes rather than operational practice.

We learned to spend more time observing than interviewing. Walking workshops, field observations, toolbox meetings and operational conversations consistently revealed information that process documentation never captured.

Management of Change helped identify operational hazards associated with the changes to these practices. OCM helped understand why people relied upon them in the first place.

Rather than eliminating every workaround, we learned to distinguish between valuable operational flexibility and unnecessary inefficiency. Some informal practices represented organisational resilience. Others represented organisational failure. Understanding the difference became one of our most valuable skills.

Leadership Visibility Matters More Than Leadership Messaging

Executives often believe that sending emails or speaking at launch events demonstrates leadership support. Experience taught us otherwise.

People observe what leaders consistently do rather than what they occasionally say.

If leaders continue to request reports outside the EAM system, bypass governance, or tolerate old behaviours, employees quickly conclude that nothing has really changed. Every leadership action either reinforces or weakens organisational change.

We therefore shifted considerable effort toward coaching leaders instead of simply preparing communication packs. Leaders learned how to ask different questions, use new information, reinforce expected behaviours and demonstrate confidence in the new operating model.

Management of Change requires leaders to authorise and govern operational changes safely. Organisational Change Management requires them to model the behaviours that sustain those changes.

Visible leadership emerged as one of the strongest predictors of long-term adoption across all the implementations we supported.

Data Problems Are Usually Business Problems

Many projects treat poor data quality as a technical issue. We learned it is almost always a business issue.

Missing assets, duplicate equipment, inconsistent naming conventions and unreliable maintenance history are rarely caused by software. They reflect unclear ownership, inconsistent governance and varying operational practices developed over many years.

No migration tool can solve poor accountability.

Rather than focusing solely on data cleansing, we began working with organisations to establish ownership of information throughout the asset lifecycle. We encouraged operational leaders to become custodians of their own information rather than expecting IT departments to maintain business knowledge.

Management of Change ensured information changes were controlled. OCM ensured people understood why accurate information mattered and how it supported better operational decisions.

The result was not simply better data but greater organisational trust in information.

Training Does Not Create Capability

One of the biggest misconceptions in change programs is that training equals readiness.

Completing a training course does not mean someone can confidently perform their role under operational pressure.

We repeatedly observed users completing classroom training successfully but struggling during go-live because they lacked confidence, coaching and practical experience.

Our approach evolved beyond traditional training programs. We incorporated simulations, operational scenarios, peer coaching, floor walking, performance support materials and ongoing learning pathways.

Management of Change focused on ensuring people could safely perform changed activities. Organisational Change Management focused on developing confidence, competence and sustained capability.

Capability is developed over time, not delivered in a classroom.

Projects Finish. Change Does Not.

Many organisations treat go-live as the finish line.

In reality, it is the beginning.

The weeks immediately following deployment often determine whether the organisation adopts the new operating model or quietly returns to previous behaviours.

Hypercare should therefore focus as much on organisational confidence as technical support. Users need reassurance, coaching and rapid responses to operational issues while new habits develop.

We learned to measure adoption rather than simply measuring system availability. Were planners planning? Were supervisors using dashboards? Were decisions changing? Was governance operating as intended?

Management of Change ensured the transition remained operationally safe. OCM ensured that new behaviours became the norm.

The project may end, but organisational change continues long afterwards.

Governance Changes Behaviour More Than Communications

Communication creates awareness.

Governance creates consistency.

We discovered that organisations often invest enormous effort producing newsletters, presentations and launch events while leaving governance unchanged.

People quickly learn which behaviours are actually rewarded.

When governance continues to approve poor data, bypass planning, or allow local workarounds, communication loses credibility.

Our focus shifted toward embedding governance into operational routines, leadership meetings, performance reviews, decision-making processes and accountability structures.

Management of Change governs the introduction of change. Organisational Change Management governs the sustainability of change.

Real organisational transformation occurs when governance reinforces the desired behaviours every day.

Commercial Tension

One of the least discussed but most influential factors in large Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) implementations is commercial tension. It exists on almost every major programme, regardless of the software vendor or System Integrator (SI). The tension is not usually created by poor intentions. Rather, it stems from the fact that different organisations are often measured, rewarded and contractually obligated to achieve different outcomes.

A System Integrator is typically contracted to deliver a defined scope within agreed cost, schedule and contractual milestones. Their commercial success is often measured by completing design, configuration, testing, deployment, and handover in accordance with the Statement of Work. The client organisation, however, is investing in something very different. The business is not seeking to complete a project; it is

seeking to improve maintenance performance, increase asset reliability, reduce risk, improve decision-making and realise long-term business benefits.

These objectives are related but not the same.

As a result, tension naturally develops as the programme progresses. The SI may be focused on achieving a contractual milestone, while the business may feel it is not yet ready to proceed. A design may be considered complete because the documented deliverables have been signed off, while operational leaders believe important scenarios have not been adequately considered. Testing may satisfy contractual acceptance criteria, yet frontline users may still lack confidence in performing their daily work. From the SI's perspective, the milestone has been achieved. From the business's perspective, the organisation may still be some distance from being ready to realise value.

Neither perspective is inherently wrong.

The mistake is assuming that contractual completion and organisational readiness are synonymous.

This tension is often amplified by governance and reporting. The PMO may report that milestones are on schedule even though contractual deliverables have not been accepted. Meanwhile, Change Management may report low readiness, the Data Team may still be resolving quality issues, Business Process Owners may have unresolved concerns, and operational leaders may be requesting additional preparation before go-live. Executive sponsors are then presented with two apparently contradictory views of the same programme: one indicating success, the other highlighting significant risk.

Organisational Change Management plays a critical role in bridging this gap. Rather than positioning the SI and the business as opposing parties, OCM helps establish a shared definition of success that extends beyond contractual delivery. Programme governance should include both delivery milestones and benefit milestones. Technical completion should be accompanied by measures of organisational readiness, user capability, leadership preparedness, data confidence and operational acceptance. These indicators provide executives with a more balanced understanding of whether the organisation is genuinely ready to progress.

The most successful programmes also recognise that benefit realisation cannot be outsourced. While an SI can implement software, configure workflows and migrate data, only the business can embed new behaviours, establish new governance, improve decision-making and sustain improved asset management practices. The contract may define what the SI must deliver, but it cannot guarantee that the organisation will change.

Experienced System Integrators understand this dynamic and work collaboratively with clients to achieve business outcomes rather than meet contractual obligations. Likewise, mature client organisations recognise that continually delaying milestones without clear justification creates commercial uncertainty and undermines partnership. The objective is not to eliminate commercial tension; it is to manage it transparently

through shared governance, open communication and a common focus on long-term organisational value.

Ultimately, an EAM implementation should not be judged by whether the System Integrator completed the Statement of Work. It should be judged by whether the organisation improved its ability to realise value from its assets. When contractual milestones and benefit milestones are deliberately aligned, commercial tension becomes far easier to manage, and both the client and the SI are more likely to achieve what they set out to accomplish.

Every Organisation Already Has a Culture, Projects Reveal It

Projects do not create organisational culture. They expose it.

High-performing organisations generally embrace collaboration, transparency and shared accountability. Low-performing organisations often reveal fragmented ownership, competing priorities and siloed decision-making during major transformation programs.

Rather than attempting to change culture directly, we learned to change the daily experiences that gradually shape culture.

When leaders collaborate, when governance is consistent, when systems are trusted and when people experience success using new processes, culture evolves naturally.

Management of Change addresses immediate operational impacts. OCM influences the longer-term behavioural environment in which those operational changes become embedded.

Culture becomes the outcome, not the starting point.

Organisational Change Management and Management of Change Need Each Other

Perhaps the greatest lesson from our careers has been recognising that neither discipline succeeds alone.

Management of Change without Organisational Change Management produces technically successful implementations that people never fully adopt.

Organisational Change Management without Management of Change creates enthusiasm without sufficient operational discipline, governance or risk management.

Throughout our careers, we have increasingly integrated both disciplines into a single delivery approach. One manages organisational adoption. The other manages operational transition. One focuses on people and behaviours. The other focuses on implementing change safely and sustainably.

Neither replaces the other.

When organisations deliberately combine OCM and MoC, projects become organisational transformations rather than software implementations. Benefits are

realised more quickly, capability grows more naturally, and new ways of working are sustained long after the project team has departed.

Looking back across decades of projects, this has become our defining lesson. Successful Enterprise Asset Management is never just about systems, processes or technology. It is about helping organisations change safely, confidently and permanently. That is where Organisational Change Management and Management of Change are at their strongest, working together rather than in parallel.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
People do not resist change; they resist uncertainty, poor leadership and being excluded from the journey.	Every operational change deserves appropriate governance, regardless of how small or routine it appears.
Successful adoption is earned through trust, involvement and visible leadership, not communication plans alone.	Operational excellence depends upon disciplined decision-making, documented approvals, and clear accountability.
Technology implementation is the easiest part of transformation; changing habits, behaviours and culture is where the real work begins.	Shortcuts taken during implementation often become long-term operational risks that organisations inherit for years.
The organisation always knows more than the project team. The role of practitioners is to uncover that knowledge, not replace it.	Good governance enables change; it should never be viewed as unnecessary bureaucracy when protecting people, assets and services.
An EAM implementation finishes when the project closes; organisational change only finishes when the new way of working becomes the normal way of working.	Operational integrity should never be compromised in pursuit of project deadlines, budgets or implementation milestones.
The greatest legacy of any change program is not the system it delivers, but the organisational capability, confidence and leadership it leaves behind.	The organisations that consistently perform best are those that continuously improve while never losing control of operational risk.

Structured Change Framework Perspective	
Primary Phase	Depart
Also Supports	Discover
Why it matters	Reflection completes one change journey while informing the next, reinforcing that organisational change and asset management are continuous disciplines.

Writing this book has reminded me that my greatest lessons were rarely learnt during successful projects. They came from difficult conversations, unexpected setbacks, and the humility of realising I didn't yet understand the organisation I was trying to help

well enough. Those experiences shaped my belief that organisational change is fundamentally about people, trust and leadership.

If there is one thing I hope readers take away from my perspective, it is this: don't measure your success by the system you implement. Measure it by the capability, confidence and resilience you leave behind. Technology will always evolve. Organisations that learn how to adapt together will always have the advantage. (Martin)

Looking back across my career, many project lessons have come from the tension between commercial delivery priorities and the organisation's long-term operational needs.

Technology partners bring valuable capability, but the business must retain ownership of decisions affecting governance, risk, operating models and future support.

Management of Change is not a project phase. It is the organisational capability that ensures short-term delivery decisions do not weaken long-term operational performance. (Peter)

Two Perspectives, One Shared Journey

From Martin

When I look back over my career, one thing has become clearer with every organisation, every implementation and every conversation with operational leaders: technology has never been the hardest part of change. People are. Organisational Change Management is not about communication plans, training schedules or stakeholder registers. It is about helping organisations understand why they work the way they do today, creating the confidence to let go of familiar behaviours, and building the capability to embrace better ways of working.

Throughout this book, I have shared the lessons I have learned, sometimes through success, sometimes through failure, but always through practice. If there is one message I hope you take away, it is that…

Organisational Change Management is not something you do to support an EAM implementation. It is something you do to help an organisation become better at managing its assets, people, and future.

Asset Management itself is not a destination, and neither is Organisational Change Management. Both are continuous journeys of learning, adapting, improving and maturing. If this book encourages you to see change not as a project but as an organisational capability, then Peter and I will have achieved exactly what we set out to do.

From Peter

Throughout my career I have been fascinated by how organisations manage change, not simply organisational change, but the disciplined Management of Change that protects knowledge, controls risk and ensures that improvements are introduced deliberately rather than accidentally. Whether the change is to an asset, a business process, a system, data, documentation or organisational structure, every change creates consequences that extend well beyond the moment it is approved.

Good Management of Change ensures those consequences are understood, governed and sustained. Working alongside Martin over the past two decades has reinforced something we have both observed repeatedly: organisations that separate technical change from human change rarely achieve the outcomes they expected. The most successful organisations recognise that Organisational Change Management and Management of Change are complementary disciplines, each strengthening the other. Like Asset Management itself, neither discipline is ever truly complete. They evolve as organisations evolve, as technologies advance and as expectations change.

Good Management of Change isn't about preventing change; it's about enabling change safely and responsibly.

Continuous improvement is not simply a principle of Asset Management; it is equally the principle of managing change. My hope is that this book encourages you to build both capabilities together, because organisations that learn to manage change well become capable of sustained success.

Our Final Thought

As brothers, people often assume we have always thought the same way. The reality is quite the opposite. Throughout our careers, we have challenged each other's ideas, debated approaches, questioned assumptions and, at times, passionately disagreed. Martin naturally viewed the world through the lens of people, culture, leadership and Organisational Change Management. Peter instinctively focused on governance, discipline, engineering thinking and the Management of Change. More often than not, we approached the same problem from different directions.

With experience came perspective. We came to realise that neither of us was entirely right, and neither of us was entirely wrong. We were looking at the same challenge through different lenses. By listening to each other, respecting our differences and being prepared to change our own thinking, we both became better practitioners. Those conversations, debates and shared experiences over more than twenty years have shaped not only the way we work together but also the way we understand organisational transformation. In many ways, this book is the product of those conversations.

If there is one lesson that sits above everything else in these pages, it is this:

Successful organisations do not improve simply by implementing better technology. They improve by developing the capability to continuously enhance how people, processes, information, governance, and technology work together.

Enterprise Asset Management provides the discipline for managing assets throughout their lifecycle. Organisational Change Management helps people embrace and sustain new ways of working. Management of Change provides the governance that ensures change is introduced thoughtfully, safely and sustainably. Each discipline strengthens the others. None is optional, and none is ever finished.

Between us, we have spent decades working across software development, engineering, enterprise systems, asset management, information management, business transformation and organisational change. We have worked with organisations large and small, across industries, cultures and countries. We have celebrated successful transformations and learned invaluable lessons from those that struggled. Every project has reinforced the same truth: sustainable success is rarely about having all the answers. It is about asking better questions, bringing together different perspectives and never assuming there is only one right way.

This book has never been about presenting ourselves as academics or theorists. We are practitioners. Everything we have shared comes from experience; sometimes hard-earned experience. We wrote this book because we wanted others to benefit from the lessons we have learned over our combined careers, hopefully making your own journey a little easier than ours was.

We hope that, somewhere within these chapters, you found an idea that challenged your thinking, a lesson that validated your own experience, or a practical approach you can apply in your organisation. If you did, then every hour spent reflecting on our careers, recording our conversations and bringing those experiences together has been worthwhile.

Finally, remember that neither Asset Management nor Change Management has a finish line. They are not destinations to be reached or projects to be completed. They are continuums of learning, adaptation, improvement, and maturation. Organisations evolve. Technology evolves. People evolve. The best organisations recognise that their greatest competitive advantage is not the systems they own but their ability to continually learn and continually change.

Thank you for joining us on this journey. We hope our experiences have contributed, in some small way, to yours. Keep asking questions. Keep challenging assumptions. Keep learning from those who think differently. That has been one of our greatest lessons as brothers, colleagues, and change practitioners, and we believe it is one of the most valuable lessons any organisation can learn.

Martin & Peter Kerr

Structured Change Framework (SCF)

Built from Practice, Not Theory

Every consulting organisation has a methodology. Every software vendor has an implementation approach. Every project management office has a governance framework. Yet after more than two decades of working on Enterprise Asset Management (EAM), ERP, digital transformation and organisational change initiatives, we found that many of these approaches shared a common weakness: they focused heavily on activities and deliverables. Still, they often overlooked the human journey required to make change successful.

The Structured Change Framework was not developed in a boardroom or university. It evolved over many years through real projects, real organisations and real people. Some of those projects were highly successful. Others taught us valuable lessons about what happens when leadership is absent, governance is weak, communication becomes one-way, or technology is expected to solve organisational problems.

Every difficult implementation contributed something to the framework. Every successful transformation reinforced what genuinely creates sustainable organisational change.

As brothers, Peter and I often approached problems differently. Peter's background in software development, systems architecture and the Management of Change naturally focused on technical certainty, configuration control and implementation discipline. My background in Organisational Change Management centred on leadership, culture, behaviour, capability and adoption. Over time we realised neither perspective was sufficient on its own. (Martin)

Technology without organisational adoption rarely delivers business value.

Equally, enthusiasm without disciplined implementation rarely delivers operational capability.

The Structured Change Framework brings these two worlds together.

It provides a practical roadmap that recognises organisational change is not simply about communications, training or stakeholder engagement. Nor is it solely about project management, technology deployment or governance. It is about deliberately moving an organisation from today's way of working to a future operating model where new behaviours become normal business practice.

The framework consists of five interconnected phases:

- DISCOVER
- DEFINE
- DESIGN
- DELIVER
- DEPART

Although these phases appear sequential, organisational change is rarely linear. New information often requires organisations to revisit earlier assumptions. Learning continues throughout the implementation. Readiness evolves. Leaders mature. The organisation gradually develops confidence in the future state.

The framework should therefore be viewed as a continuous learning cycle rather than a rigid project lifecycle.

Most importantly, the framework recognises that successful change practitioners work themselves out of a job. The ultimate objective is not to remain embedded within the organisation indefinitely, but to build leadership capability, organisational ownership and sustainable ways of working that continue long after the project team has departed.

Organisational (Client) Perspective

Many change frameworks are written for change practitioners. They explain what the Change Manager should produce, what activities should be completed, and what deliverables are expected throughout a project.

The Structured Change Framework (SCF) is intentionally different.

While it provides guidance for Organisational Change Management (OCM) professionals, it is equally a framework for the organisation itself. It describes the organisational responsibilities required to create an environment where change can succeed.

The framework is built on a simple premise:

Successful change is not something that happens to an organisation. It is something the organisation actively helps create.

Throughout every phase of the SCF, the organisation has decisions to make, leaders to engage, capabilities to develop, risks to manage and behaviours to reinforce. Change practitioners facilitate these activities, but they cannot own them.

The SCF helps organisations understand:

- What leadership should be doing.
- What business owners should be deciding.
- What project teams should be delivering.
- What operational teams should be preparing for.
- What success should look like before, during and after implementation.

This is particularly important within Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) programs.

Implementing an EAM solution is rarely just a technology project. It requires changes to governance, asset information, decision-making, work management, planning, maintenance practices, supply chains, finance, engineering, operations and

leadership. Every one of these areas belongs to the organisation, not the software vendor, not the system integrator and not the change manager.

The SCF therefore becomes a shared roadmap.

It provides a common language between executives, project teams, operational leaders, system integrators and change practitioners so that everyone understands not only what needs to happen, but who is responsible for enabling it.

Rather than asking, "Where is the project up to?", organisations begin asking:

- Are we discovering what truly matters?
- Have we defined success clearly enough?
- Are we designing the future organisation as well as the future system?
- Are we delivering sustainable capability, not just software?
- Are we departing the project while ensuring the organisation continues to improve?

These questions shift the focus from project completion to organisational capability.

Ultimately, the Structured Change Framework is not owned by the project team.

It is owned by the organisation.

Because once the project finishes, the organisation continues, and the change must continue with it.

Over the years I've realised that the organisations that succeed are rarely the ones with the biggest budgets or the best technology. They're the ones that understand that change belongs to the business, not the project. I've seen change managers become frustrated because they're expected to 'deliver adoption' while the organisation remains largely unchanged. That's simply not how sustainable change works. The SCF was designed to make organisational ownership visible. Every phase asks the business to lead, make decisions and build capability. My role as an OCM practitioner is to help people navigate that journey, not to take the journey on their behalf. (Martin)

Coming from a Management of Change background, I've learned that introducing new systems or processes without changing the surrounding operating environment creates unnecessary risk. Every modification has consequences some technical, some operational and many human. What I appreciate about the SCF is that it encourages organisations to think about change as an integrated system rather than a series of isolated activities. Whether we're managing engineering changes, operational procedures or an Enterprise Asset Management implementation, the organisation itself must own the change. Projects may initiate change, but operational excellence sustains it. (Peter)

Discover

Understanding Before Changing

The Discover phase is often underestimated because organisations are eager to begin designing solutions. Yet this phase determines whether the project will solve the right problems or automate existing inefficiencies.

Before deciding what should change, organisations must first understand how they currently operate, not simply how documented processes suggest work should happen, but how work actually gets done.

What the Organisation Needs to Consider

During Discover, the organisation should seek to understand:

- Strategic drivers for change
- Business pain points
- Current operational performance
- Asset management maturity
- Digital maturity
- Leadership capability
- Organisational readiness
- Existing culture
- Informal work practices
- Stakeholder expectations
- Existing governance
- Current systems and technology landscape
- Data quality
- Business process maturity
- Political landscape
- Existing improvement initiatives
- Organisational capacity for change

This phase requires curiosity rather than assumptions.

It is about listening more than presenting.

What Change Practitioners Are Doing

During Discover, Organisational Change practitioners are actively:

- Building executive relationships
- Conducting stakeholder analysis
- Interviewing operational personnel
- Facilitating workshops
- Assessing organisational readiness
- Understanding culture
- Identifying risks
- Mapping informal influence networks

- Assessing communication effectiveness
- Identifying potential change champions
- Measuring change maturity
- Understanding competing priorities
- Beginning leadership coaching
- Building trust across the organisation

Rather than promoting solutions, they become students of the organisation.

Their objective is to understand the business deeply enough to influence meaningful change later.

ISO 10020 Alignment

The Discover phase establishes organisational understanding before solutions are designed.

Activities include:

- Understanding organisational maturity
- Business drivers
- Leadership alignment
- Stakeholder identification
- Current operating model
- Organisational readiness
- Risks
- Benefits
- Current capability

These activities closely align with ISO/TS 10020's Governance Process and Change Scenario Process, which establish organisational context, objectives, risks, opportunities and strategic direction.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Discovery begins by listening before proposing solutions.	Existing operational controls should be understood before they are modified.
Every organisation has a unique culture that influences how change will be received.	Current operational risks should be documented before defining future changes.
Understanding informal behaviours is as important as documenting formal processes.	Critical operational processes should be identified and protected throughout the transformation.
Stakeholder trust is built through curiosity rather than assumptions.	Existing governance arrangements should be reviewed to understand decision authority.
Discovery should identify organisational strengths and opportunities for improvement.	Asset, safety and regulatory obligations should be understood before designing change.

The best solutions emerge from understanding the organisation rather than imposing external methodologies.	Operational knowledge gathered during discovery provides the foundation for safe implementation.

Define

Creating Shared Direction

Once the organisation understands its current state, attention shifts towards defining where it intends to go.

Many projects assume everyone shares the same vision.

Experience tells us they rarely do.

The Define phase establishes a common understanding of success, business outcomes, and organisational priorities.

What the Organisation Needs to Consider

Key considerations include:

- Vision for the future
- Business outcomes
- Success measures
- Benefits
- Future operating model
- Governance principles
- Decision-making authority
- Scope boundaries
- Strategic priorities
- Roles and responsibilities
- Investment rationale
- Executive sponsorship
- Change governance
- Risk appetite
- Guiding principles

Without alignment here, every subsequent decision becomes more difficult.

What Change Practitioners Are Doing

The OCM team focuses on:

- Developing the Change Strategy
- Creating the communication strategy
- Establishing change governance
- Defining stakeholder engagement plans
- Developing readiness measures
- Creating leadership alignment workshops
- Identifying capability requirements

- Defining adoption measures
- Developing benefits realisation measures
- Establishing reporting frameworks
- Building the Change Network
- Creating sponsorship plans

Their role is to ensure organisational clarity develops alongside project clarity.

ISO 10020 Alignment

Define translates understanding into organisational direction.

Within this phase, organisations establish:

- Vision
- Success measures
- Governance
- Business ownership
- Change strategy
- Stakeholder strategies
- Capability requirements

This closely aligns with ISO's Management Processes for identifying interested parties and defining organisational interventions.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Defining success requires agreement on business outcomes before discussing technology.	Proposed operational changes should be assessed for risk before detailed planning begins.
A shared vision creates organisational alignment and commitment.	Governance frameworks should define how future changes will be authorised.
Organisational readiness should influence implementation planning.	Responsibilities for operational decision-making should be clearly assigned.
Benefits should be meaningful to employees, leaders and customers alike.	Compliance obligations should be incorporated into planning from the outset.
Leadership alignment reduces uncertainty throughout the organisation.	Every proposed operational change should have an accountable owner.
The Define phase establishes why the organisation is changing and what success looks like.	Effective planning reduces operational uncertainty during later implementation phases.

Design

Designing More Than Technology

Technology projects frequently spend enormous effort designing software while giving comparatively little attention to designing future ways of working.

The Structured Change Framework deliberately treats organisational design as equally important as technical design.

This is where future business capability begins to emerge.

What the Organisation Needs to Consider

The organisation should consider:

- Future business processes
- Future governance
- Future organisational structure
- Operating model
- Decision rights
- Roles and responsibilities
- Capability requirements
- Learning pathways
- Reporting structures
- Data ownership
- Asset information governance
- Business policies
- Performance measures
- Leadership behaviours
- Employee experience

Technology should support these decisions, not determine them.

What Change Practitioners Are Doing

Change practitioners are:

- Supporting process design workshops
- Challenging assumptions
- Ensuring business participation
- Developing learning strategies
- Designing communication approaches
- Building change impact assessments
- Identifying behavioural impacts
- Designing reinforcement mechanisms
- Supporting leadership preparation
- Planning stakeholder engagement
- Developing readiness plans
- Working alongside solution architects and business analysts

They continually ask one important question:

"What will people actually do differently on Day One?"

ISO 10020 Alignment

Design creates the future organisation.

This includes:

- Future processes
- Future roles
- Learning pathways
- Communications
- Business readiness
- Operating model
- Future information
- Decision rights

ISO refers to these as intervention definition activities.

The SCF adds to this by recognising that an Enterprise Asset Management implementation simultaneously redesigns:

- People
- Process
- Technology
- Information
- Governance
- Leadership
- Behaviour

rather than simply introducing organisational interventions.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Future-state design should improve how people work, not simply how systems operate.	Future operational processes should maintain essential controls while improving efficiency.
Employees who contribute to design are more likely to support implementation.	Process changes should preserve operational integrity throughout the asset lifecycle.
Role clarity encourages accountability and collaboration.	Governance should define approval pathways before implementation begins.
Good design simplifies work rather than increasing organisational complexity.	Configuration decisions should be evaluated for operational consequences.
Information should empower people to make better decisions.	Asset information standards should remain controlled throughout system design.
Design succeeds when business capability drives technology decisions.	Every approved design should support safe, reliable and compliant operations.

Deliver

Turning Plans into Reality

Deliver is where planning meets reality.

Configuration becomes deployment.

Training becomes capability.

Leadership becomes visible.

This is also where uncertainty is highest.

Organisations naturally focus on technical delivery, but sustainable success depends equally on confidence, support and adoption.

What the Organisation Needs to Consider

During delivery, the organisation should focus on:

- Business readiness
- Testing participation
- Leadership visibility
- Communication
- Training completion
- Capability development
- Hypercare preparation
- Risk management
- Issue resolution
- Operational ownership
- Business engagement
- Reinforcement planning
- Performance monitoring
- Adoption measurement

Implementation is not the finish line.

It is the beginning of organisational adoption.

What Change Practitioners Are Doing

Throughout Deliver, OCM practitioners are:

- Coaching leaders
- Delivering communications
- Supporting training
- Monitoring readiness
- Measuring adoption
- Managing resistance
- Supporting testing activities
- Facilitating business engagement
- Coordinating champions
- Providing hypercare support
- Collecting feedback
- Tracking behavioural indicators
- Adjusting interventions where required

Their work becomes highly visible as they help individuals navigate uncertainty and build confidence in new ways of working.

ISO 10020 Alignment

Deliver moves from planning into execution.

Activities include:

- Testing
- Training
- Communications
- Readiness
- Go-live
- Hypercare
- Coaching
- Adoption measurement
- Leadership support

These closely reflect ISO's Implementation Processes, including issue identification, identification of affected interested parties, intervention execution, and change reporting.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Delivery succeeds when people are confident, capable and supported.	Deployment should proceed only after operational readiness has been confirmed.
Testing is as much about organisational learning as it is about software validation.	Operational controls should be validated during testing and deployment.
Hypercare builds confidence by supporting people through uncertainty.	Operational issues should be prioritised according to business risk.
Leadership visibility is most important during deployment.	Temporary operational workarounds should remain governed and documented.
Reinforcement transforms project activities into lasting organisational behaviours.	Every operational change should remain traceable from approval through implementation.
Go-live represents the beginning of organisational adoption rather than the end of project delivery.	Successful delivery maintains operational stability while introducing new capability.

Depart

Leaving the Organisation Stronger Than We Found It

The final phase has a deliberately unusual name.

Most methodologies finish with "Close" or "Complete."

We chose "Depart" because successful Organisational Change Management should eventually become unnecessary.

If the organisation still depends on external consultants after implementation, then capability has not truly been transferred.

The goal is organisational independence.

What the Organisation Needs to Consider

The organisation should focus on:

- Business ownership
- Leadership accountability
- Continuous improvement
- Governance sustainability
- Capability maintenance
- Benefits realisation
- Ongoing learning
- Operational performance
- Cultural reinforcement
- Change capability
- Knowledge retention
- Future optimisation

The project may end.

The organisational journey does not.

What Change Practitioners Are Doing

During Depart, practitioners focus on:

- Transitioning ownership
- Coaching leaders
- Final capability transfer
- Closing governance activities
- Documenting lessons learned
- Reviewing benefits
- Measuring adoption maturity
- Confirming business ownership
- Supporting continuous improvement
- Establishing long-term success measures
- Conducting post-implementation reviews

The greatest compliment a Change Practitioner can receive is that the organisation no longer needs them.

When leaders confidently lead change, managers reinforce new behaviours, employees continuously improve the way they work, and the business owns both the system and its future, Organisational Change Management has achieved its purpose.

That is what the Structured Change Framework was designed to accomplish!

ISO 10020 Alignment

Depart is perhaps where the SCF extends furthest beyond traditional project thinking.

Rather than treating go-live as the finish line, the framework focuses on:

- Business ownership
- Benefits realisation
- Continuous improvement
- Organisational maturity
- Asset Management maturity
- Knowledge retention
- Capability development
- Leadership sustainability

This aligns strongly with ISO's emphasis on reporting, governance feedback and continual improvement while recognising that organisational capability continues to evolve long after projects have closed.

Summary

(OCM) Observations	(MoC) Observations
Project success is measured by what the organisation sustains after the project team leaves.	Operational governance should transition seamlessly from project structures to business ownership.
Continuous improvement depends upon leaders reinforcing desired behaviours.	Future operational changes should continue to be implemented in accordance with established governance processes.
Knowledge transfer is one of the project's most valuable deliverables.	Configuration, documentation and operational records should be complete before project closure.
Business ownership replaces project ownership as the organisation matures.	Post-implementation reviews should verify that operational objectives have been achieved.
Organisational capability should continue growing long after project completion.	Lessons learned should strengthen future operational governance and decision-making.
A successful departure leaves behind confidence, capability, and continuous improvement, not dependency on the project team.	The best projects leave organisations better equipped to manage future change safely and effectively.

If there is one lesson we have learnt from applying the Structured Change Framework across dozens of organisations, it is that successful transformation is never achieved by technology alone. It is achieved when people, leadership, governance, operational discipline and organisational purpose move together. The framework gives structure to the journey, but it is the people who ultimately determine whether the destination is realised. That is why Organisational Change Management and the Management of Change will always remain two sides of the same coin. (Martin & Peter)

ISO/TS 10020 Organizational Change Management

Why we included ISO 10020

When we developed the Structured Change Framework (SCF), we drew on years of practical delivery experience across Enterprise Asset Management, organisational change, digital transformation and operational improvement. The framework evolved through projects that succeeded, struggled, and taught us valuable lessons about how people, leadership, and organisations respond to change.

Only after ISO published ISO/TS 10020:2022 did we step back and compare the framework with the international guidance. What surprised us was not that they were identical they are not but that the underlying principles aligned so closely. Both recognise that organisational change is deliberately planned, stakeholder-centred, supported through targeted interventions, and continually measured.

This appendix is therefore not intended to demonstrate compliance. Instead, it helps readers understand how an internationally recognised OCM process model relates to the practical framework used throughout this book.

SCF and ISO/TS 10020 Alignment

Structured Change Framework	Primary ISO/TS 10020 Alignment	How they complement one another
Discover	Governance Process, Change Scenario Process, Interested Party Identification	Establishes organisational context, defines the change, identifies drivers, stakeholders, benefits and risks before detailed planning begins.
Define	Intervention Definition Process, Change Objectives & Strategy	Converts business understanding into practical change strategies, governance, communication, capability and implementation planning.
Design	Intervention Definition, Issue Identification	Designs future operating models, roles, processes, data, learning and business readiness interventions that support adoption.
Deliver	Implementation Processes	Executes interventions, supports impacted stakeholders, manages readiness, monitors adoption, measures progress and reports performance.
Depart	Reporting, Continuous Feedback, Governance Improvement	Embeds new ways of working, measures realised value, transfers ownership and continuously improves organisational capability. ISO emphasises feedback from implementation into governance and strategy, closely aligning with SCF's Depart phase.

Mapping the Structured Change Framework to ISO/TS 10020

The Structured Change Framework (SCF) was not developed by reverse engineering an international standard. It emerged from more than two decades of delivering Enterprise Asset Management (EAM), ERP, Asset Information Management and Organisational Change Management initiatives across multiple industries.

Throughout those projects, we continually refined our approach based on what actually helped organisations succeed. Some lessons came from highly successful implementations. Others came from projects that struggled because technology advanced more quickly than the organisation itself.

After ISO/TS 10020:2022 Quality Management Systems – Organisational Change Management – Processes was published, we compared the framework against the specification. Rather than finding conflict, we found considerable alignment. The international specification describes the governance, management and implementation processes that support organisational change, while the Structured Change Framework provides practitioners with a practical lifecycle for applying those concepts throughout an Enterprise Asset Management transformation.

This appendix is not intended to demonstrate compliance with ISO/TS 10020, nor does it imply endorsement by ISO. Instead, it illustrates how an experience-based framework aligns with internationally recognised organisational change management principles while extending them into the practical realities of EAM implementation.

Structured Change Framework	Primary Purpose	Closest ISO/TS 10020 Process Group	Relationship
Discover	Understand why change is needed	Governance Process and Change Scenario Process	Establishes organisational context, drivers, strategy, risks, benefits and stakeholder understanding before planning begins.
Define	Agree what success looks like	Management Processes	Defines objectives, identifies interested parties and establishes organisational interventions and governance.
Design	Design the future organisation	Intervention Definition Process	Develops future operating models, capability, communications, learning, governance, and business-readiness interventions.
Deliver	Prepare and support people through implementation	Implementation Processes	Executes interventions, monitors readiness, supports adoption,

			measures progress and manages deployment.
Depart	Sustain organisational capability	Reporting, Governance Feedback and Continual Improvement	Embeds ownership, measures realised value, captures lessons learned and continually improves organisational capability.

Mapping this book to ISO 10020

Book Area	SCF Phase	Primary ISO/TS 10020 Alignment	Commentary
Part One – Why EAM Implementations Underperform	**Discover**	Governance Process	Understanding organisational context and the reasons for change.
Part Two – Preparing the Organisation	**Discover**	Governance Process	Building strategy, readiness, business drivers and leadership commitment.
Part Three – Understanding the Business	**Discover / Define**	Change Scenario Process and Interested Party Identification	Understanding current state, stakeholders, culture and business requirements.
Part Four – Designing the Future	**Define / Design**	Intervention Definition Process	Designing future operating models, capability, governance and learning.
Part Five – Leading the Organisation	**Design**	Intervention Definition Process	Leadership, communications and capability development become targeted organisational interventions.
Part Six – Working with the EAM Project	**Design / Deliver**	Issue Identification and Intervention Planning	Integrating project delivery with organisational change activities.
Part Seven – Deployment and Adoption	**Deliver**	Implementation Processes	Testing, readiness, deployment, hypercare and adoption support.
Part Eight – Sustaining Enterprise Asset Management	**Depart**	Reporting and Governance Feedback	Benefits realisation, continuous improvement and organisational ownership.
Lessons Learned	**All Phases**	Entire ISO Process Model	Reflection and continual improvement reinforce future organisational maturity.

Final Reflections

Martin

As I reflected on the journey of writing this book, one thing became increasingly clear to me: organisations often think of change as something with a beginning and an end. A business case is approved, a project is delivered, the system goes live, and everyone moves on to the next initiative. In my experience, that thinking is one of the biggest reasons so many Enterprise Asset Management programs never realise their full potential.

Don't measure your success by the system you implement. Measure it by the capability, confidence and resilience you leave behind.

The Structured Change Framework was never intended to be a rigid methodology or a series of boxes to tick. It grew from years of working alongside organisations that were trying to solve real business problems. Sometimes we succeeded brilliantly, sometimes we learned difficult lessons, but every experience reinforced the same principle: effective organisational change is continuous. We are constantly discovering new opportunities, redefining priorities, redesigning ways of working, delivering improvements and then stepping back so the business can own the outcomes before the cycle begins again. That is why I believe both Organisational Change Management and Asset Management are continuums, not destinations.

Peter

Looking back over my career, I have always been fascinated by how organisations manage risk, control change and maintain the integrity of their operations. Whether I was working in software development, engineering, asset-intensive industries or Management of Change, I kept seeing the same pattern. Technology and processes might change, but sustainable success always depended on people understanding their role, taking ownership and continually improving what they do.

For me, the Structured Change Framework reflects that reality. It acknowledges that every implementation is simply another stage in an organisation's evolution. Each project provides new knowledge that should influence the next initiative, and every lesson learned should become part of the organisation's capability. Good Management of Change and good Organisational Change Management are both built on discipline, learning and continuous improvement.

Operational excellence is never accidental.

They are not activities that finish at go-live; they become part of how a mature organisation operates. If this book encourages readers to see change as an ongoing

capability rather than a one-off project, then I believe we have achieved exactly what we set out to do.

Good Management of Change isn't about preventing change; it's about enabling change safely and responsibly.

Acknowledgement of Intellectual Influence

Every practitioner stands on the shoulders of those who came before them. Throughout our careers, we have learned from colleagues, clients, mentors, project teams, industry bodies, and the many authors who have advanced the fields of Asset Management, Change Management, Leadership, Project Delivery, and Information Management. While this book presents our own experiences and reflections, we gratefully acknowledge the contribution of these communities in shaping our thinking over many decades.

Any errors, omissions or opinions expressed remain entirely our own.

Works Cited Throughout the Book

Although this book is founded on the practical experience of Martin Kerr and Peter Kerr, a number of internationally recognised standards, frameworks and publications are referenced throughout the text. These works have shaped modern thinking in Enterprise Asset Management, Organisational Change Management, leadership, governance and digital transformation, and have informed many of the principles discussed in this book.

Unlike a traditional academic text, these works are referenced because they provide useful context and supporting concepts rather than being the primary source of the ideas presented. The lessons, observations and practitioner reflections throughout this book are drawn principally from decades of hands-on implementation experience across asset-intensive organisations.

The principal works referenced throughout this book include:

- ISO 15288 – Systems and Software Engineering
- ISO 55000 – Asset Management
- ISO 55001 – Asset Management Systems
- ISO 55002 – Guidance for Asset Management Systems
- ISO 55010 - Guidance on the alignment of financial and non-financial functions in asset management
- ISO 8000 – Data Quality
- ISO 9001 – Quality Management Systems
- ISO 10007 – Configuration Management
- ISO/TS 10020 – Organisational Change Management
- ISO 14224 – Reliability and Maintenance Data
- ISO 19650 – Building Information Modelling

- ISO 31000 – Risk Management
- ISO 44001 – Collaborative Business Relationship Management
- ADKAR – A Model for Change in Business, Government and Our Community
- Leading Change - Kotter, John P.
- Managing Transitions - William Bridges
- Organizational Culture and Leadership - Edgar H. Schein

References and Further Reading

The ideas presented throughout this book are drawn from more than 50 years of combined practical experience in delivering Enterprise Asset Management (EAM), Asset Management, organisational transformation, and technology-enabled business change. While this book is intentionally experience-based rather than academic, many of the principles discussed align with internationally recognised standards and the work of respected practitioners and researchers.

Readers wishing to explore these topics further may find the following references valuable.

Asset Management

Asset Management Council. AMBoK® – Asset Management Body of Knowledge. Asset Management Council, Australia.

Institute of Asset Management (IAM). (2015). Asset Management – An Anatomy (3rd ed.). Bristol, UK.

International Organization for Standardization. (2014). ISO 55000: Asset management — Overview, principles and terminology. Geneva: ISO.

International Organization for Standardization. (2014). ISO 55001: Asset management systems — Requirements. Geneva: ISO.

International Organization for Standardization. (2014). ISO 55002: Asset management systems — Guidelines for the application of ISO 55001. Geneva: ISO.

PAS 55 (Historical Reference). Asset Management Specification. British Standards Institution.

Organisational Change Management

International Organization for Standardization. (2022). ISO/TS 10020:2022 – Quality management systems — Organizational Change Management — Processes. Geneva: ISO.

Hiatt, J. (2006). ADKAR: A Model for Change in Business, Government and Our Community. Prosci.

Hiatt, J., & Creasey, T. J. (2012). *Change Management: The People Side of Change*. Prosci.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading Change*. Harvard Business School Press.

Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading Change* (Revised Edition). Harvard Business Review Press.

Kübler-Ross, E. (1969). On Death and Dying. New York: Macmillan.

Bridges, W. (2009). *Managing Transitions* (3rd ed.). Da Capo Press.

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in Group Dynamics. Human Relations, 1(2), 143–153.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field Theory in Social Science. Harper & Row.

Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. (2021). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (5th ed.). Wiley.

Leadership and Organisational Behaviour

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to Great*. Harper Business.

Lencioni, P. (2002). *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team*. Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P. M. (2006). The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization. Doubleday.

Argyris, C. (1999). *On Organizational Learning* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.

Business Improvement and Process

Hammer, M., & Champy, J. (1993). *Reengineering the Corporation*. HarperBusiness.

Rummler, G. A., & Brache, A. P. (2012). Improving Performance: How to Manage the White Space on the Organization Chart (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Project and Programme Delivery

Project Management Institute. (2021). A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® Guide) (7th ed.).

Axelos. (2020). Managing Successful Programmes (MSP®) (5th ed.).

Axelos. (2023). *PRINCE2*® (7th ed.).

Enterprise Architecture and Information

The Open Group. (2022). *TOGAF® Standard* (10th Edition).

DAMA International. (2017). DAMA-DMBOK2: Data Management Body of Knowledge (2nd ed.).

Zachman International. The Zachman Framework™ for Enterprise Architecture.

ISO/IEC/IEEE 15288:2023 – Systems and Software Engineering — System Life Cycle Processes. Geneva: ISO.

Enterprise Asset Management and Reliability

Moubray, J. (1997). *Reliability-Centred Maintenance* (2nd ed.). Butterworth-Heinemann.

Smith, A. M., & Hawkins, B. (2004). *Lean Maintenance*. Elsevier.

Wireman, T. (2010). Benchmarking Best Practices in Maintenance Management. Industrial Press.

Human-Centred Design and Adoption

Norman, D. A. (2013). *The Design of Everyday Things* (Revised and Expanded Edition). Basic Books.

Nielsen, J. (1994). *Usability Engineering*. Morgan Kaufmann.

Digital Transformation

Westerman, G., Bonnet, D., & McAfee, A. (2014). *Leading Digital*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Kane, G. C., Palmer, D., Phillips, A. N., Kiron, D., & Buckley, N. (2015). *Strategy, Not Technology, Drives Digital Transformation*. MIT Sloan Management Review.

Glossary of Terms

The following glossary provides a common language for readers throughout this book. Some terms originate from internationally recognised standards such as ISO 55000 and ISO/TS 10020, while others reflect the practical language used by practitioners delivering Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) transformations. The definitions have been intentionally written in the context of Organisational Change Management and real-world implementation experience.

Acceptance Criteria

The agreed conditions that define when a deliverable, business process, capability or system function is considered complete and ready for operational use.

Adoption

The extent to which people consistently use new systems, processes and behaviours as intended. True adoption occurs when new ways of working become normal practice rather than enforced compliance.

Asset

An item, thing or entity that has potential or actual value to an organisation. Assets may be physical, digital, financial, informational or human.

Asset Information

The data, documentation and knowledge required to make informed decisions throughout the asset lifecycle.

Asset Lifecycle

The complete journey of an asset from planning and acquisition through operation, maintenance, renewal and disposal.

Asset Management

The coordinated activities of an organisation to realise value from its assets.

Asset Management Maturity

The degree to which an organisation consistently applies asset management principles, governance, capability and continuous improvement.

Benefits Realisation

The ongoing process of measuring whether organisational outcomes and business value are achieved following implementation.

Business Capability

What an organisation can do independently of any particular technology solution.

Business Case

The justification for investing in change, considering strategic, operational, financial, regulatory and organisational outcomes.

Business Process

A repeatable series of activities performed to achieve a defined organisational outcome.

Business Readiness

The organisation's preparedness to successfully adopt new ways of working.

Business Rules

Agreed organisational decisions that determine how work should be performed or controlled.

Capability

The combination of people, process, technology, information and governance required to consistently achieve business outcomes.

Capability Uplift

Improving the knowledge, skills, behaviours and organisational capability needed to operate successfully in the future state.

Change Champion

An individual who actively supports, promotes and reinforces change within their area of influence.

Change Fatigue

The reduced capacity of individuals or organisations to successfully absorb additional change due to competing priorities or prolonged transformation.

Change Saturation

The point at which the volume of organisational change exceeds people's ability to successfully adopt it.

Change Strategy

The overall approach used to prepare, support and sustain organisational change.

Configuration

The controlled definition of how software, information or assets are structured and managed.

Continuous Improvement

The ongoing process of improving organisational performance through learning, measurement and refinement.

COTS

Commercial Off the Shelf. (Software that is configured, not customised)

Culture

The shared values, behaviours and beliefs that influence how work is actually performed.

Customer Outcomes

The benefits customers experience because the organisation has improved how it manages its assets and services.

Data

Raw facts collected about assets, activities or business operations.

Data Governance

The framework of ownership, standards, controls and accountability used to manage organisational information.

Data Migration

The movement of information from one system to another while improving quality, consistency and usefulness.

Data Quality

The accuracy, completeness, consistency and reliability of information.

Decision Rights

Clear definition of who has authority to make which business decisions.

Digital Literacy

The confidence and capability required to effectively use digital systems and information.

Digital Trust

Confidence that organisational information is accurate, governed and suitable for decision making.

EAM (Enterprise Asset Management)

An integrated approach to managing physical assets, information, work, resources and lifecycle decisions to maximise organisational value.

Embedding Change

The process of making new behaviours and business practices part of normal operations.

Executive Sponsorship

Visible leadership commitment that actively supports organisational transformation.

Future State ("To Be")

The desired operating model that an organisation intends to achieve following transformation.

Governance

The structures, decision-making processes, roles and controls used to direct and oversee organisational performance.

Go-Live

The point at which a new solution becomes operational.

Hypercare

An intensive period of business support immediately following deployment to stabilise operations and build user confidence.

Information

Data that has been organised and given context to support decision-making.

Information Architecture

The structure describing how information flows across business systems and processes.

Information Governance

The policies, ownership, and controls that ensure information remains trusted and fit for purpose.

Information Maturity

The organisational capability to create, manage and use information consistently.

Integration

The controlled exchange of information between systems.

KPI (Key Performance Indicator)

A measurable indicator used to evaluate organisational performance.

Knowledge

Experience and understanding gained through applying information in practice.

Leadership Alignment

Shared understanding and commitment among leaders regarding organisational direction and priorities.

Learning Pathway

A structured approach to developing knowledge and capability over time.

Legacy System

An existing system being replaced or integrated into the future environment.

Management of Change (MoC)

The disciplined governance of individual operational, technical or organisational changes to ensure they are evaluated, approved, implemented and documented safely.

Master Data

Core business information that provides a consistent organisational reference, such as asset hierarchies, locations or equipment classifications.

Metadata

Information that describes other information, making it easier to locate, manage and understand.

Maturity

The level of organisational capability demonstrated through consistent and repeatable practices.

Operating Model

The combination of people, process, technology, governance and information used to deliver organisational value.

Organisational Capability

The organisation's collective ability to consistently achieve strategic and operational objectives.

Organisational Change Management (OCM)

The structured discipline of preparing, supporting and enabling people and organisations to successfully adopt and sustain new ways of working.

Organisational Readiness

The extent to which an organisation is prepared to transition successfully from its current state to its future state.

Operational Readiness

The ability of operational teams to safely and effectively perform work immediately following implementation.

Performance Support

Resources that help employees perform work successfully after formal training has finished.

Practitioner

Someone who applies knowledge through practical experience rather than theory alone.

Process

A defined sequence of activities that produces an organisational outcome.

Process Ownership

Clear accountability for designing, governing and improving business processes.

Psychological Safety

An environment where individuals feel safe to ask questions, challenge ideas and report issues without fear.

Readiness Assessment

A structured evaluation of an organisation's preparedness for change across leadership, capability, culture, governance, data and technology.

Resistance

Natural human responses that slow or prevent adoption of change.

Risk

The effect of uncertainty on organisational objectives.

Role-Based Training

Learning designed specifically around the responsibilities of individual business roles.

SCF (Structured Change Framework)

The five-phase practitioner framework developed by the authors, consisting of Discover, Define, Design, Deliver, and Depart, is used to guide Enterprise Asset Management transformations.

Source of Truth

The trusted system or information source recognised as authoritative.

System

A system is a collection of interconnected components that work together to achieve a common purpose.

Stakeholder

Any individual or group affected by, or able to influence, organisational change.

Sustainable Capability

The organisational ability to continue improving after project completion.

To Be

The desired future operating environment.

Training Needs Analysis (TNA)

The process of identifying learning requirements for specific business roles.

Trust

Confidence that leaders, information, systems and governance are reliable and consistent.

User Acceptance Testing (UAT)

Business-led testing that confirms a solution is fit for operational use.

Value

The measurable or perceived benefit realised from assets, people, information and organisational capability.

Vision

A clear description of the future organisational state that change seeks to achieve.

Ways of Working

The practical combination of behaviours, processes, governance and collaboration used by an organisation to achieve its objectives.

Work Management

The end-to-end planning, scheduling, execution and recording of work activities.

Workflow

The sequence of activities performed within a business process, often supported by technology.

Our Definition

Throughout this book we deliberately distinguish between Asset Management, the Management of Change (MoC) and Organisational Change Management (OCM). While they are complementary disciplines, they are not interchangeable. Asset Management defines how an organisation realises value from its assets. Management of Change ensures modifications to operational systems and infrastructure are introduced safely and under control. Organisational Change Management focuses on enabling people to successfully adopt new ways of working so that investments deliver their intended business outcomes.

When these three disciplines operate together, organisations implement technology more effectively, build sustainable capability, reduce operational risk and realise lasting value from their Enterprise Asset Management investments.

The End

Every organisation's journey will be different. Every asset portfolio will present unique challenges. Every culture will respond to change in its own way. Yet one principle remains constant:

Organisations that create lasting value from their assets do so through their people.

Technology will continue to evolve. Standards will mature. New methodologies will emerge. But leadership, trust, collaboration, learning, and the willingness to adapt will always remain at the heart of sustainable change. If this book encourages you to ask better questions, engage people more meaningfully, make more informed decisions, and approach Enterprise Asset Management as an ongoing organisational capability rather than a one-time project, then it has achieved its purpose.

Thank you for allowing us to share our experiences, our successes, our failures, and the lessons we have learned together. We hope that wherever your journey leads, you continue to build organisations that not only manage assets exceptionally well but also create enduring value for the people, communities, and generations they serve.

Martin & Peter