International Journal of Innovative Research in Computer Science & Technology (IJIRCST)
ISSN: 2347-5552, Volume-10, Special Issue-12, December-2022
Innovative Projects 2022
Organized by Presidency University, Bangalore, India

A Brief Discussion on Management Considerations and Summary

Dr. Ramalingam Mageshkumar
Asst Professor, Department Of Management, Presidency University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id-mageshkumar@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

System engineering contains intricate procedures and tasks that need efficient administration to guarantee project success. An overview of the main management factors and a synopsis of their importance in system engineering are given in this abstract. System engineering projects need effective management to make sure that all components of the development process are coordinated and carried out effectively. Planning and requirement management, risk management, collaboration and communication, resource management, quality assurance, and verification are all important management factors in system engineering. These factors play a crucial role in directing the efficient creation, use, and upkeep of complex systems. Following these guidelines makes it easier to make wise decisions, reduces project risks, improves stakeholder participation, and makes sure that high-quality systems are delivered that meet or exceed user expectations.

KEYWORDS:

Acquisition Reform, Fidelity, Integrity, Management Considerations.

I. INTRODUCTION

The decision-making process in every organisation must include management concerns. In order to accomplish organisational objectives and maximise performance, effective management requires rigorous analysis, planning, and implementation of plans. This encompasses things like operations, financial matters, and organisational structure in general. The efficiency, productivity, and long-term performance of firms may all be improved by taking into account certain management concerns. Managerial factors are essential for organisations to succeed in the fast-paced and fiercely competitive business climate of today. Businesses may make educated judgements, manage resources efficiently, and accomplish their strategic goals by concentrating on important areas including human resources, operations, finances, and organisational structure [1], [2].

Talent acquisition, training, and performance management are a few of the components of managing human resources that go into making sure the company has the appropriate people in the right positions with the correct abilities. In order to increase productivity and efficiency, operational concerns include simplifying workflows, optimising procedures, and putting best practises into practise. To guarantee solid financial health and sustainability, financial management issues include budgeting, financial planning, and cost control. Designing a strong framework that encourages responsibility, cooperation, and communication inside the organisation is another factor to take into account when determining the organisational structure. This entails creating distinct reporting lines, outlining duties and responsibilities, and promoting an open and empowered culture. Organisations may enhance decision-making, reduce risks, and effectively adapt to market changes and difficulties by addressing these management factors. To remain competitive and achieve long-term success, it is critical for firms to continually evaluate and adjust their management techniques [3], [4].

II. DISCUSSION

The Environment for Acquisition Reform

No one participating in the department's or a supplier's system acquisition can escape thinking about how to manage acquisition in the context of the present reform climate. In many respects, improving acquisition management implies altering the way we handle the systems engineering process. All of these reform approaches are directly connected to systems engineering management, such as using performance standards (instead of full design specifications), putting design choices in the hands of contractors, and deferring government control over configuration baselines. Already in this text, it has been established that managing the technical effort in a reform context is a challenge. Systems engineering procedures and systems engineers in general are mostly the victims

of their own triumphs in this setting. To add discipline to the process of creating very complex systems, the systems engineering approach was developed. Its goal is to make sure that specifications are thoroughly considered and translate into intricate designs. Understanding and controlling specifics are required by the process. Additionally, the procedure was effective [5], [6].

Using the procedures outlined in this work, manufacturers have since the 1960s created a number of systems that are ever-more competent and dependable in collaboration with government programme offices. The issue is that we have excessively layered controls, reports, and reviews on top of the process in many instances. As a consequence, even as technological life cycles have sharply shrunk, the cycle time needed to create systems has climbed to intolerable levels. The truth is that we often create amazing systems, but they take too long to create, cost too much, and are frequently out of date when they are ultimately created. Systems engineering management must act now if change is to occur because the call for change has been made. The issue then becomes: How should one operate in this environment to succeed? We have a procedure that results in excellent systems; how can we improve upon the approach that has worked successfully for us?

The fundamental tenet of acquisition reform is that we can enhance our capacity to provide our users highly competent systems at affordable costs and on time. If we manage design and development in a manner that fully utilises the knowledge present both with the government and the contractor, we can. This means that the government will express its needs in terms of desired performance outcomes rather than specific design solutions that are necessary. In a similar vein, contractors will choose detailed design approaches that deliver the desired performance and will then be held accountable for the performance actually achieved [7], [8].

The DoD and other governmental organisations have both adopted this strategy. During its early deployments, there were a number of instances when government management made the conscious decision to keep the government's technical employees apart from contractors in an effort to prevent the government from imposing design solutions. This was predicated on the contractor stepping up to make sure all required engineering disciplines and activities were covered. The data gathered after the fact revealed that the contractor in more than one instance failed to go ahead in a manner consistent with ensuring that standard engineering management principles were incorporated when the government pulled back to a less prescriptive role in design and development. Investigation conducted after the fact revealed that crucial steps in the systems engineering process were either willfully skipped through or disregarded in a number of instances where issues developed [9], [10].

The issue in each instance seems to have been a breakdown in the contractor-government line of communication, which was exacerbated by a failure on the side of the government to guarantee that standard engineering management practises were followed. One of the most crucial lessons was that, while the systems engineering method can and should be customised to the particular demands of the programme, there is a significant risk in doing so. One must make sure that choices are acceptable for the risks that characterise the programme before choosing to skip phases, omit reviews, or take other measures that seem to yield shorter schedules and less expense.

Engineering management choices made at random provide subpar technological outcomes. Assessing the engineering management programme for its compatibility with the technical realities and dangers faced, as well as communicating his/her findings and suggestions to management, is one of the fundamental requirements inherent in systems engineering. The DoD's position on this matter is quite clear. Most of the time, it is not anticipated that the government would take the initiative in developing design solutions. This does not absolve the government, however, of its obligation to the taxpayers to put good technological and managerial procedures in place. In order to ensure that the technical management requirements for the programme are properly communicated to programme managers and the contractor, the systems engineer must take the lead in creating those needs.

Communication: Integrity and Trust

Undoubtedly, being able to communicate effectively is one of the key characteristics for a successful systems engineer. The fundamental knowledge that communication requires two elements a transmitter and a receiver is essential to efficient communication. Even if we have a good message and the ability to communicate our opinions in ways that others can comprehend, actual communication could not happen if the intended recipient choose not to listen to us. What can engineer managers do to advance their own interests and make sure that their statements are heard and understood? One may do a lot to train people to pay attention and take what they say seriously, but one can also do the exact opposite and train people to disregard what they say. Establishing reputation based on honesty and trust is the main issue.

But it would be acceptable to talk about the systems engineer's position on the management team first. Systems engineering as it is used in the DoD is essentially engineering management. The systems engineer is required to include conventional management issues like cost, time, and policy into the technical management equation in addition to integrating the technical disciplines in making recommendations. Senior levels of management anticipate the systems engineer in this position to comprehend the rules governing the programme and to appreciate the need of cost and schedule. Additionally, they anticipate the senior engineer to strike a compromise between technical performance goals and budget and schedule restraints in the absence of strong reasons to the contrary.

Does this imply that the engineer should put his moral duty to provide fair engineering judgement behind his ethical duty to be a helpful team member? Without a doubt! However, it does imply that in order to be treated fairly when expressing doubts based on technical judgement, one must be seen as a team member. The person who consistently opposes the status quo, disapproves of existing policies, and, generally, refuses to attempt to understand different points of view, will ultimately become alienated. When people stop listening, communication breaks down, and even points of view that are legitimate are lost since the message is no longer reaching its intended audience.

Engineering managers may further influence people to be receptive to their opinions by developing a reputation for making reasoned decisions in addition to being team players. Managers need to be technically skilled as a prerequisite for building such a reputation. They must be able to make technical decisions supported by a solid comprehension of the guiding principles of science and technology. Systems engineers need to have the training and experience necessary to have faith in their technical judgements. It is improbable that engineering managers will be able to acquire the respect of individuals with whom they must collaborate without that type of knowledge. Systems engineers, however, cannot be experts in every field that must be combined to produce a successful system. As a result, systems engineers need to be aware of their knowledge's boundaries and seek help when necessary.

Systems engineers must also have a solid reputation for honesty. They must have shown a readiness to stand up for moral principles when necessary and to take the difficult decision even in the face of strong temptations to do differently. Engineers may also, although insignificantly, increase communication with team members (particularly those without engineering backgrounds) by being confident in their arguments and being clear in their explanations. Many engineers have a natural desire to provide their opinion on an issue together with all the facts, figures, statistics, and necessary evidence that led to the position being formed. Occasionally, this leads to the explanation of a watch's mechanism when the question was simply, "What time is it?"

Team members will often rely on the engineer's judgement and will presume that all necessary justification is there without having to see it unless it is explicitly stated differently. There are rare circumstances in which it is acceptable to explain how the watch works, but most of the time, communication is improved and time is saved by giving a sure-footed and succinct response. Communication issues are less likely to prevent effective engineering management when systems engineers demonstrate their strength, expertise, and ability to work well in a team context.

Ethical Importance

Engineering is a profession that is surrounded by a variety of conflicting interests. One or more examples include changes in operational hazards, requirements, technology, legislation, and policies, as well as changes in the focus placed on customising policies in a sensible manner. Organisations using the integrated product and process development strategy are exposing these conflicting interests on a regular basis. Engineers can use the communication strategies discussed earlier in this chapter and the systems engineering tools discussed in earlier chapters of this book as a guide to effectively argue for the value of the product's technical aspects in a setting where competing interests are prevalent. But what do engineers do when they feel that the leadership or integrated team is not placing enough attention on the technical issues?

This subject becomes particularly challenging when it comes to product safety or when someone's life is in danger. The person is not given a clear set of instructions on how to handle ethical integrity problems. On an integrated team, everyone is accountable for ethics. Engineers do not have a particular position as ethical watchdogs because of their technical expertise, despite the fact that they are undoubtedly the advocates for the technical parts of the integrated solution.

The information offered in this book is concentrated on the specifics of the traditional systems engineering process and the function of the systems engineer as the principal practitioner with regard to those activities. For

many years, both DoD and commercial product development have successfully adopted the systems engineering methodology that has been outlined. In that regard, hardly much novel or revolutionary information has been presented in this work. Instead, we have attempted to explain this tried-and-true method in enough depth to make it reasonable and clear as a tool for planning, designing, and developing goods that must adhere to a predetermined set of criteria. Systems engineers in the DoD are required to act as engineering managers for the given programme or project. They must comprehend that the position of the systems engineer is fundamentally distinct from that of the programme manager and from that of the functional engineer with a constrained scope of practice. In a way, the systems engineer's job is sensitive since they must strike a balance between technical issues and the actual management demands resulting from budget, schedule, and policy. The systems engineer often occupies the intermediate position, which is seldom a comfortable one. That person is the target of this text.

The purpose of the first two sections of the work was to provide the reader with a thorough overview of systems engineering as a discipline and to highlight the place that systems engineering plays in the DoD acquisition management process. The purpose of Part 2 in particular was to provide rather in-depth insights into the different tasks that make up the process. The government systems engineer may discover that they are more intimately engaged in certain of the intricate processes' operations than in others. Government systems engineers, for instance, can find themselves heavily engaged in requirements formulation and analysis but less so in design synthesis. Government engineers still have a duty to comprehend the process and see that good procedures are followed when making design choices despite the fact that they do not actively synthesise designs. Understanding the specifics of the procedure is crucial for this reason.

From an engineering management standpoint, Part 3 of the book is perhaps its most important section. We have covered a number of ideas in Part 3 that fall under the broad category of systems analysis and control. The sequence of requirements analysis, functional analysis and allocation, and design synthesis processes determines the engine that converts requirements into designs. The systems engineer's job entails a large amount of progress evaluation, alternative consideration, and product consistency and fidelity to the design criteria. In order to successfully do these duties, a good engineering management effort primarily uses the tools and techniques described in Part 3.

Finally, we discussed some of the factors that the engineering management must take into account in Part 4 in addition to the adoption of a structured systems engineering approach. The planning function and concerns about product improvement and integrated team management must move to the forefront of the systems engineer's thinking from the very beginning of work on any system, especially in today's environment where new starts are rare and resources are frequently constrained.

The key actions and problems involved with the conduct and administration of technical activities on DoD programmes and projects have been tried to be condensed in this book. It was written as an addition to the Defence Systems Management College's training materials. One sign of a complicated program's likelihood of success has been identified as the methodical application of the systems engineering concepts. But as always, the trick is for the practitioner to be able to take in these basic ideas and then adapt them to the particular situations they are faced with. We anticipate that the book will be helpful for readers as they navigate the problems they will encounter as engineering managers in the future.

III. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, management considerations are essential for the efficient and effective execution of projects. These factors include a range of topics, including resource allocation, planning, coordination, communication, and risk management. Organisations may improve their capacity to satisfy project goals, provide high-quality results, and achieve overall success by addressing these aspects. Setting defined objectives, establishing the project scope, and creating an execution strategy all depend on effective project planning. It entails defining activities, making time and resource estimates, and scheduling the project. Organisations can manage dependencies, deploy resources efficiently, and reduce delays and disruptions with the help of adequate planning. In order to effectively manage teams and stakeholders, coordination and communication are essential. Open and honest communication encourages teamwork, aligns expectations, and makes sure that everyone is working towards the same objective. Regular meetings, progress reports, and feedback systems help to coordinate well and allow quick decision-making.

REFERENCES

[1] B. Barry, A. A. Erwin, J. Stevens, and C. Tornatore, “Fingolimod Rebound: A Review of the Clinical Experience and Management Considerations,” Neurology and Therapy. 2019. doi: 10.1007/s40120-019-00160-9.

[2] M. Calamita, C. Coachman, N. Sesma, and J. Kois, “Occlusal vertical dimension: treatment planning decisions and management considerations,” The international journal of esthetic dentistry. 2019.
[3] D. G. Cope, “Cancer Pain Management Considerations in Older Adults,” Seminars in Oncology Nursing. 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.soncn.2019.04.008.
[4] D. Stournaras and K. Petrovic, “Fibromyalgia treatment and management considerations for nurse practitioners,” J. Am. Assoc. Nurse Pract., 2019, doi: 10.1097/JXX.0000000000000178.
[5] A. N. Jadhav and P. R. Tarte, “Acute cardiovascular complications in patients with diabetes and hypertension: Management consideration for minor oral surgery,” J. Korean Assoc. Oral Maxillofac. Surg., 2019, doi: 10.5125/jkaoms.2019.45.4.207.
[6] E. M. Cornett et al., “Comprehensive Perioperative Management Considerations in Patients Taking Methadone,” Current Pain and Headache Reports. 2019. doi: 10.1007/s11916-019-0783-z.
[7] E. Kakani, D. Sloan, B. P. Sawaya, A. El-Husseini, H. H. Malluche, and M. Rao, “Long-term outcomes and management considerations after parathyroidectomy in the dialysis patient,” Seminars in Dialysis. 2019. doi: 10.1111/sdi.12833.
[8] A. Mucha and A. Trbovich, “Considerations for diagnosis and management of concussion,” Journal of Orthopaedic and Sports Physical Therapy. 2019. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2019.8855.
[9] M. R. Lozier, A. M. Sanchez, and J. J. Lee, “Levo-transposition of the Great Arteries in an Adult Patient: Management Considerations and Treatment Strategy,” Cureus, 2019, doi: 10.7759/cureus.4306.
[10] R. Hofmeyr, K. Bester, A. Willms, J. Hewitson, and C. Byhahn, “Tracheoesophageal fistula following button battery ingestion in an infant: Airway management considerations,” Anaesthesist, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s00101-019-00679-4.