



***Lean Opportunity Assessment
Presentation to the Forest Practices Board
May 8, 2012***



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?**