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About your consultant

- **David Howe**
  - President of Strategica, Inc.
  - Consulting since 1986
  - Conducting process improvement and Lean projects since 1988
  - Working with WA State agencies since 1994
  - 10 years with Price Waterhouse
  - 13 years with Strategica
  - MBA, Wharton Business School
About the Project

- Select process elements of the Adaptive Management Program and use Lean techniques to:
  - Reduce cycle times (i.e., reduce the time it takes to process rule changes)
  - Eliminate non-value adding work

**Lean Process Transformation**

- Popularized by Japanese manufacturers
- Process improvement method that emphasizes eliminating non-value adding work or processes
- Emphasizes setting quantitative performance targets and benchmarks
- Uses process improvement techniques such as converting sequential tasks to parallel tasks, eliminating the use of paper documents, streamlining rules and policies, eliminating work queues and downtime
Processes selected

- Criteria used for selecting AMP process elements for Lean:
  - Supports the Lean vision,
  - It is really a process,
  - Ability of the organization to control most aspects of the process,
  - Lean Results can be achieved timely,
  - Process performance is measureable,
  - Stakeholder interest.

- Based on the criteria, the process elements selected for Lean include:
  - Scoping paper
  - Study design
What we did

- Mapped current work processes for scoping paper and study design
- Redesigned the processes using lean techniques
- Mapped out proposed processes
- Key features of the redesigned processes:
  - Fewer review and approval steps
  - More reliance on small teams of qualified writers
  - Fewer input/comment/decision points for CMER
  - Expedited peer review for projects with less potential for rule change
  - New process should be piloted
What we did

- Comparing the “As-Is” process to the “To-Be”
  - As-Is process:
    - 74 months in cycle time
    - 9 separate “do-loops” totaling 16 iterations
    - 12 different approval points for five separate documents (e.g., study design, response matrix)
  - To-Be Process:
    - 15 months in cycle time
      - 80% reduction from As-Is process
    - 3 separate “do-loops”
    - 5 different approval points for five separate documents
    - Assumes appropriate scientific/technical expertise is available to compose the Technical Writing & Implementation Groups (TWIGs)
Observations on AMP structure

- Distinction between CMER and Policy representation is fuzzy
- Excessive due process
- Consensus voting to move projects forward contributes to long cycle times. Does it need to be a full consensus?