

**Author:** Tomohiro Goto

- Company: Being Co., Ltd.

- Title: Senior Consultant, TOC Think Tank

**Audience:** General audience

**Conference Format:** Presentation session

**Industry:** Project Management

**Presentation title:** "Bottom-up implementation of Multi-project CCPM -Case study of Mazda, Japan"

**The topic of the presentation [Short summary]:**

Study the process of "bottom-up typed implementation of multi-project CCPM in Mazda, from the perspective of author's various experiences of CCPM implementation and consultation to many companies in Japan including Mazda's case. Why Japanese GEMBA people resist the Top-down decision of CCPM introduction? Why many of Japanese companies select the bottom-up approach rather than top-down? Through this study, the author is trying to figure out the key factor of the successful CCPM introduction to Japanese companies.

**Long Abstract:**

Study the process of "bottom-up typed implementation of multi-project CCPM in Mazda, from my perspective based on various experiences of CCPM implementation and consultation to many companies in Japan. Since 2005, I have introduced CCPM, and provided professional consulting service and CCPM application support to a number of Japanese companies. My clients are from various kinds of industries as manufacturing, IT, Game software development, and Entertainment industry. The size of companies I was involved was from small organizations with less than 10 employees to the large with several thousands of employees. I have also involved in introducing S&T tree to the company, Being Co., Ltd. where I am working for and also many other companies. Through my CCPM specialized experiences, I have realized that there is a common process of CCPM deployment in Japan.

The first common process is the "Top-down typed implementation of multi-project CCPM in line with S&T tree". Needless to say, this powerful approach can bring us significant results in a short period of time by co-work across the organization. However, there are many cases in Japan where this type of approach is not easily accepted by organization.

- Case1. Strong resistance against CCPM by middle management and GEMBA even if the top management agree and promote the introduction of CCPM to their organization.

-Case2. Top management agree to introduce CCPM to their organization, however, top management is not strong enough to promote CCPM implementation by their leadership. In most of this kind of cases, they pay huge attention to middle management and GEMBA to see if they can get a real cooperation from their middle management and GEMBA, and to see how their middle management and GEMBA feel about CCPM.

-Case3.

Though middle management and GEMBA need more improvement by CCPM, top management doesn't accept and agree to the concept of CCPM.

As a result, the CCPM trial with small scale within very limited projects or a tiny part of the entire organization is required for their startup, which is forcing them to start from "Single-project CCPM" or "Multipul single project CCPM". Applying CCPM to the entire organization is mostly postponed until the small pilot projects get a significant result which brings a confidence in CCPM to middle management and GEMBA. Once the result from pilot projects with a concept of CCPM is confirmed by them, they proceed to the next larger stage. This is the implementation process of "bottom-up typed multi-project CCPM".

For example, the case of Mazda is not the exception.

I have been involved in consulting to Mazda, power train development headquarters, since October, 2007 when Mazda started CCPM introduction for the first time. For the initial CCPM implementation in Mazda, I visited Mazda every week and worked very hard to start up CCPM with Mr. Kidani (now R & D Technical Management General Manager ) who was the driving leader of this project at Powertrain Planning Department. Mazda is actually the very typical large Japanese organization who adopted the approach of "bottom-up typed multi-project CCPM". The Single-project CCPM activity lasted more than a year until middle management and GEMBA obtained a certain confident in CCPM. Even though their top management had agreed upon the introduction of CCPM, they had a fear to introduce CCPM widely with a top-down approach in their organization because of their mistakes experienced in the past. However, a certain pilot project, which made a very significant success of reducing project duration to 50%, from 2 years of initial plan to 1 year completed, gave all the stakeholders in their organization a strong confident, and it lead Mazda to apply full CCPM introduction to the Sky active technology projects multiplied by the fate of the company.

Here is another example from Japanese IT company.

Although the movement of "Multi-project CCPM introduced in line with the S&T Tree" appeared from a part of their middle management, there was a situation where no one from their top management and middle management trusted CCPM. So they started operation with "Multipul single project CCPM" and "Visualization of all their projects."

In three months from their start of "Multipul single project CCPM", we found out that excessive packing of projects ware causing,

1. Spreading bad multitasking

2. Significant project delays associated with bad multitasking
3. Exhaustion of resources

Because of the fact which was visualized by “Multipul single project CCPM”, top management and middle management could smoothly agreed to start pipeline management of the projects respecting its Flow. I have realized again that the fact and evidence cleared by “Multipul single project CCPM” make people take real actions.

These two cases shows that we need at first to gain a trust and confident with respect to CCPM before we proceed to organizational behavior. There are times people/organization cannot move only by theory itself. It happens not only to middle management but also to top management as well.

You have migrated to the spontaneous activities of all members currently in the Mazda and transition confidence in the CCPM obtained in bottom-up to top-down .

I believe that the top-down is not the only way of proving the concept of CCPM, which is just one of various methods. We can prove the concept of CCPM by bottom-up, even by “middle down” or “middle up”.

### **3 learning objectives:**

1. Knowing what motivate engineers in Japan, the Kaizen nation.
2. Understanding the true meaning of "WA" brought by CCPM implementations in Japan.
3. Seeing massive future possibility of CCPM improvement

### **3 questions:**

1. Is it true that the top-down approach doesn't work at all in Japan?
2. When do you start introducing each way of CCPM implementation to the client? ; Single project, Multiple single, Full multi-project. From the very beginning or gradually starts after a while?
3. In case of bottom-up, I assume that the initiative could be derailed by the reassignment of a key champion. Have you experienced such a situation?