

Project Plan

IPRO-349 Group 3.1

Partner Experience Management for Multioperator and Warehouse Counting Systems

June 26th, 2007

Supervisor: Stanisław Zbroja
IIT Faculty Advisor: Dr. David Pistrui



COMARCH
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY





Table of Contents

Section 1

- ❖ Introduction..... 2
- ❖ Objectives..... 2
- ❖ Background..... 3

Section 2

- ❖ Methodology/Brainstorm/Work Breakdown Structure 4
- ❖ Expected Results..... 5

Section 3

- ❖ Project Budget..... 6
- ❖ Schedule of Tasks and Milestone Events..... 7

Section 4

- ❖ Individual Team Member Assignments..... 8
- ❖ Designation of Roles..... 9



1.0 Introduction

Located in Krakow, Poland, IPRO-349 is different from any other IPRO that has been implemented to date. Unlike its Illinois Institute of Technology counterparts, IPRO-349 is a study abroad, an internship and a partner project with students from Akademia Górniczo-Hutnicza (AGH). Rather than separating into sub teams as a normal IPRO would, IPRO 349 is broken into completely different project groups. Each group could and should be considered a separate IPRO group. This project plan is from the perspective of Group 3.1 within IPRO-349 and adapted to fit the requirements of the company Comarch.

This report deals with the reasoning behind IPRO-349 Group 3.1 and explains how the problems presented will be solved. It is divided into four sections. Section 1 assists in the understanding of the project by providing a brief introduction of Comarch and the project's background, as well as a high level list of objectives.

Section 2 expands on Section 1's objectives by going into what type of work and how Group 3.1 will need to work in order to complete the objectives. Section 2 also explains what exactly is expected to result from their work.

Section 3 goes into the most detail as it deals with the more specific aspects of the project such as its budget and the task list, designating who does what. The human resource assignment of the project is then discussed in Section 4, further identifying the individuals in Group 3.1 and what special skills they contribute to the project.

1.1 Objectives

Partner Relationship Management (PRM) involves making the business transaction between the contracting party and product provider as smooth as possible. By the end of this internship our team hopes to have a quality PRM software solution design available for Comarch.

Our group prioritized the teams' objectives as follow:

- 1) Design an optimized PRM solution for Comarch
- 2) Research PRM discussions and reports
- 3) Explore competitor's solution



1.2 Background

Millions of companies interface with each other every day. Miscommunication between business partners can lead to loss of service, revenue and customer satisfaction. For example, if a corporation fails to fulfill a contract agreement with one of their partner companies due to a lost transaction of information, the corporation could still be at fault and could face major lawsuits. Therefore, implementing an interface in which information flow is streamlined is essential to today's businesses.

Comarch, an international software house based in Krakow, Poland, is poised to meet the growing need of partner companies:

Comarch has been developing BSS/OSS solutions for telecommunications since 1991. Today our solutions and managed services are chosen by incumbent operators, broadband and TriplePlay carriers, MVNOs/MVNEs, as well as start-up operators worldwide. We specialize in optimizing business operations and forging relationships to maximize customer profitability. Our new generation of billing, network and service management systems enable the launching of next-gen services and support innovative business models. Comarch's primary advantage lies in its extensive domain knowledge amassed in our software which we use to deliver and integrate sophisticated business IT solutions;
(Comarch's Business Process Management. 11)

Comarch has already developed a means for PRM and is currently attempting to further improve the partner experience through the automation of tasks and analysis via its software, *COMARCH Partner Management* and *COMARCH InterPartner Billing*.

Presently, there are quite a few competing companies that are also attempting to fill the need of PRM. Cerillion, Suntech and Telcordia are examples of such. These companies, however, lack essential aspects of partner relationship management. Cerillion for example does not even offer a web interface that their partners can use to access their information. Also a partner could wait up to 3 days for an invoice adjustment. These kinds of issues are unacceptable in today's business relations and could lead to failure.



2.0 Methodology/Brainstorm/Work Breakdown Structure

Comarch needs to improve their PRM software solution in order to be a competitive force in today's Telecommunications market. In order for Group 3.1 to develop a solution to this problem, PRM must be defined and understood. Because PRM is relatively new to the market, research on the topic is tricky. There are many articles that give separate solutions. The team must take these solutions and best fit them to Comarch's needs.

Group 3.1 is not reinventing Comarch's PRM solution but potentially adding to it. The team must become skilled with the current software so that identical features are not programmed and potential resources wasted. This knowledge will also provide a vital stepping stone for the research.

The team is split into two focuses: researching PRM features from journals and exploring other companies' PRM solutions. The goal of these categories is to help others' research by providing them with more data. The team discusses their research and has daily meetings to provide a better vision of their goals and final design.

Focus: Researching PRM

- Discover individual PRM features
- Define said features
- Search journals and white papers for specific features
- Prepare specific features for Exploring Competitors' Solutions to explore

Focus: Exploring Competitors' Solutions

- Navigate Competitors' PRM software
- Prepare list of new features
- Explain pseudo-technical approach to solution
- Prepare said solutions for Researching PRM
- Create new solutions to common problems

Daily Meetings

- Discuss researched features
- Discuss discovered modules
- Integrate ideas to solidify knowledge base
- Prepare new features/modules needed for defining/discovery
- Make a goal list of terms for the next day

The team's design cannot be tested due to how little time can be allocated to implement a prototype. Group 3.1 will create a user interface (GUI) during the last week of July in hopes to be able to present the design with more ease. The



team will prepare answers for questions regarding the benefits of the design and why such a solution best fits Comarch requirements.

2.1 Expected Results

The team expects to create a report which will detail what partner relationship management is, how it has been implemented by competitors, how Comarch currently implements it, what is missing in Comarch's current implementation and possible additions or changes to help improve Comarch's system of partner relationship management. This final report will then be presented to Comarch as a possible solution. If it is accepted, Comarch will take the team's suggestions and go into an implementation phase in which programmers will put into affect the team's suggestions and include the new features in their software suite.

In order to accomplish this end goal the team will have to create many small reports and present the information to each other. Members of the team will prepare information about the definition of partner relationship management is, who needs it and why. They will present this to the rest of the team so that there is a common understanding and motivation.

Other members of the team will prepare a sheet documenting what the current market offers as a solution and what Comarch competitors lack to meet the market need. This sheet will include information about competitors' partner relationship systems and their different modules, which will be rated and compared for functionality. The list will assist in determining what Comarch should focus on in its development by bringing to attention possible features that are currently lacking.

Group 3.1 expects to take the list of possible features and prioritize them according to what is truly necessary in making Comarch stand out and what is merely desirable. Along with this prioritized list, there will be explanations of why items were listed as important and why others were listed as just desirable. Future groups will be able to use the prioritized list to choose the most important functions to implement depending on the resources that the company has available for such a project.

It is also expected that Group 3.1 will be able to begin realization of our ideas through a design for GUI forms and information about which architecture is most suitable for this system. It may not be possible due to time constraints, but the team hopes that it will be accomplishable for a small prototype of their ideas to be created by the end of the internship/IPRO.



3.0 Project Budget

<u>Name</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Poster	2	400
Printing	BULK	50
Team Functions		200
	Total:	650 zł



3.1 Schedule of Tasks and Milestone Events

Task Name	Time	Start	Finish	Resources*
Project plan acceptance	1 day	26 June	26 June	ALL
Collecting documentation	5 days	25 June	29 June	
Competitor's documentation	2 days	25 June	26 June	LL, AM
Extracting interesting features and functions from Comarch's user documentation and competitor's documentation.	1 day	26 June	26 June	ALL
Definitions (CRM, PRM, CE, PE, etc.)	1 day	26 June	26 June	PP, EW
List of competitors for PRM solutions	1 days	26 June	26 June	LL, AM, EW
List of functions/features with description	2 day	26 June	27 June	PP
Functional matrix (list of features and vendors)	3 days	27 June	29 June	ALL
Continuation collecting documentation	5 days	2 July	6 July	
Priorities for functions/feature.	2 days	2 July	3 July	ALL
Finalizing matrix	1 days	4 July	4 July	LL, PP
Preparing Mid-term Report	2 days	5 July	6 July	EW, ALL
Mid-term Report	1 day	6 July	6 July	
Mid-Term Review Session (L.O. Test; project update; Peer eval.)	1.25 hrs	6 July	6 July	ALL
Analysis	5 days	9 July	13 July	
How PM works (tasks, responsibilities)	2 day	9 July	10 July	PP, EW
Models of business process for PM (list w/ desc. & diagrms)	2 day	9 July	10 July	LL, AM
PM tasks vs. self care activities. What mngr. has to do vs. partners	2 day	10 July	11 July	AM
Definition of Unique Selling Points (USP) - what is or will be unique in Comarch PRM comparing to other vendors and why	2 day	12 July	12 July	LL, EW
Proposal of NEW interesting function/features for PRM	1 day	13 July	13 July	ALL
Design for GUI forms for most interesting functions (5-10 screens, that support 2-3 business processes)	5 days	16 July	20 July	PP, EW
Architecture analysis: centralized vs. distributed. Strengths and weakness for in both cases.	5 days	16 July	20 July	LL, AM
IPRO Day Guidelines & Tips Session	1 day	17 July	17 July	ALL
Final Report preparation	3 days	22 July	25 July	
Exhibit/Poster	2 day	22 July	23 July	PP, EW
Abstract/Brochure	2 day	23 July	24 July	AM, EW
Presentation	1 day	24 July	24 July	LL, TBD
Collecting all documents on one CD	1 day	24 July	24 July	PP
Final Report	1 day	25 July	25 July	
Final Report with table of contents	1 day	25 July	25 July	EW, TBD
Team Work Product; Team Minutes	1 day	25 July	25 July	ALL
IPRO Deliverables CD and printed table of contents	1 day	27 July	27 July	PP
IPRO Projects Day Conference	3 hrs	27 July	27 July	ALL
IPRO Debriefing Session (IPRO Course Evaluation; Teamwork Survey)	1 hr	28 July	28 July	ALL

* Resources subject to change

ALL – Everyone

TBD – to be determined

LL – Lukasz Lukasik

AM – Adam Mucha

PP – Phil Pannenko

EW - Elizabeth Wong



4.0 Individual Team Members Assignments

Name	Education	Skills
Lukasz Lukasik	4 th year Applied Computer Science Akademia Górniczo-Hutnicza Interests: Teamwork	Computer programming, web design
Adam Mucha	4 th year Applied Computer Science Akademia Górniczo-Hutnicza Interests: <i>None listed.</i>	Program creation, algorithms, web services
Philip Pannenko	4 th year Computer Science Illinois Institute of Technology Interests: Business, communication	Language, planning, presenting, computer programming, web design
Elizabeth Wong	4 th year Computer Science Illinois Institute of Technology Interests: Design	Computer programming, web design, previous IPRO experience, organization

I PRO 349 Group 3.1 does not implement sub teams or team leaders. There are multiple reasons for this decision. The size of Group 3.1 plays a factor, as well as I PRO 349's unusual methodology—it is an internship as well as an I PRO. Because there are only four members in Group 3.1, any further division is purely arbitrary. As an internship, Group 3.1 is assigned a supervisor which provides goals and direction like a sponsor/faculty advisor in a normal I PRO would.

After each goal, provided by the supervisor, Group 3.1 discusses their understanding of the assignment and what needs to be done. Each group member then picks a task and works on it, integrating the other group members work as necessary. Group 3.1 uses a rather ad hoc approach which leaves the group adaptable to unknown future circumstances.



4.1 Designation of Roles

Again, because of the unusual nature of IPRO-349, not all standard roles were filled.

Comarch Supervisor – Stanislaw Zbroja

Responsible for:

- Team assignments
- Advising group
- Information

Team Leader – Philip Pannenko

Responsible for:

- Team assignment breakdowns

Secretary – Elizabeth Wong

Responsible for:

- Organizing iGROUPS
- Finalizing IPRO deliverables
- Keeping track of minutes