A poor **analysis** ensures poor **outcomes** and/or big failures. A good analysis is the basis to got the **solution**. I think almost anybody dares to deny these principles. And then, why is it so difficult to convince clients to invest in the analysis?



Nobody doubts that a solution put in place to manage any kind of information always requires an **analysis phase**. However, much of my professional life is spent trying to convince those who want to implement solutions for **information, records or content management** of they are not wasting time and resources when investing in the analysis phase.

Thinking about the reasons for this so common attitude I can find some erroneus commonplaces very difficult to avoid:

- **Commonplace 1:** "This don't need to be analyzed, technology can do it by itself." In the society of the short term thinking and the primacy of

## information technology

the goal is always quite simple: I want to touch a key and get the accurate information when I need it. For the average user this has ceased to belong to the magical world to be a daily occurrence. Technologies we use are so friendly that it is difficult to understand all the analytical work behind them. Therefore, the belief that technology solves everything, far from diminishing seems to be increasing.

- **Commonplace 2:** "Sure you can do the analysis in less time". Pressure to achieve business aims, or political outcomes in the case of governments, in

## short-term

is increasing. A drastically way to shorten timeline, when planning a project, is to reduce the analysis phase.

- **Commonplace 3:** "Most part of the analysis to be done will need to change when implementing" . There is a well-founded feeling that all IT projects are diverted, delayed and reinvented several times before getting fully implemented. I cannot deny

## Poor analysis= Poor outcomes. Why is it so difficult to convince the clients?

Written by Monday, 19 September 2011 17:14 - Last Updated Monday, 19 September 2011 17:26

this, I've seen it many times, and it is true that often what's behind the analysis has not helped too much. Almost always the analysis had been assigned charged to the

## wrong person or team

. With all due respect for the skills of IT staff, the analyses need to be conducted by people who know the business. Trying to learn the business while analyzing, is a guarantee of wrong results.

And against those commonplaces, do we have something to oppose? Probably only **persuasiv** e skills and show successful examples

of others. But don't be optimistic, when everything is going well, nobody remember the analysis phase...