Making-do – Illusion of Effective Service Process
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Background

- The added value of facilities management (FM) has been acknowledged (e.g. Jensen et al. 2012, Lindholm 2008, Appel-Meulenbroek and Feijts 2007).

- However, recent studies have also showed that the value creation phase, where input is transferred into output, has a limited capability to produce value (Jylhä 2013) due to the waste activities.
The seven waste types in lean management

- Defects
- Overproduction
- Waiting
- Transport
- Inventory
- Motion
- Excess processing


Making-do

- E.g., “to manage to live without things that you would like to have or with things of a worse quality than you would like” (Cambridge Dictionaries Oneline, available at http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/make-do (19 May 2014))

  - *Complete kit* – a set of components or information that are needed to finish a job
  - *Incomplete kit* – not all the components or information that are needed to finish the job are not available
Example on complete kit

Source of the picture: http://www.flickr.com/photos/bpitzer20/2761306179/sizes/m/in/photostream/

Source of the picture: http://www.superbwallpapers.com/photography/hamburger-6709/
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  - Complete kit – a set of components or information that are needed to finish a job
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→ The aim of this paper is to demonstrated what kind of impact incomplete information (i.e. making-do) has on a FM service process.
Theory – incomplete kit and its shortcomings

The 10 shortcomings relating to incomplete kit (Ronen, 1992)
2. Longer lead time.
3. High variance of quoted lead time.
4. Poor quality and more rework.
5. Decline in throughput.
6. Decline in productivity.
7. More operating expenses.
8. Decline in employees’ motivation.
9. Increase complexity of controls.
10. Less effort to ensure arrival of the missing kit item.
Research methods and data collection

Single case study

- Service provider is a public organisation that manages and leases governmental premises in Finland
- Customer is a public state agency
- In the selected case service process, the service provider searched for a solution for a state agency that was centralising its activities in the Helsinki Metropolitan Area (HMA).

Data collection process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Selection of the case process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 preliminary interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Written material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4 supplementary interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 check-up meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: Visualisation of the case process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Validation of the case service process
   - Review of the process by the service provider
   - Workshop with the service provider
**Visualisation of the case process**

1st attempt to find a solution

2nd attempt to find a solution
Making-do in the case service process

1. More-work-in-a-process. Activities were waiting for the missing information (e.g., missing information in layout planning and negotiations) ➔ more work in the process because the activities could not be finished.

1. Longer lead time. Because activities were done more than once (e.g., searching of premises, agreements, layout planning), lead time at the first attempted was longer.

1. High variance of quoted lead time. First attempt to find solution with incomplete information: 2.5 years. In the second attempt 6 months were needed with complete information.
Making-do in the case service process

4. **Poor quality and more rework.** Activities were done more than once (e.g., searching of premises, agreements, layout planning) or it was agreed that the outcome of the activity will be update later (i.e., rework).

4. **Decline in throughput.** N/A

4. **Decline in productivity.** Making-do was declining the productivity (2.5 year → 6 months)

4. **More operating expenses.** In addition to the making-do conducted in the case organisation, some of the purchased services from external service provider turned out to be making-do.
Making-do in the case service process

8. Decline in employees’ motivation. Employees were frustrated but it was not noticed that their motivation would have decreased.

9. Increase complexity of controls. Especially in spring/summer 2012 the complexity was increased because activities (e.g. lease agreement, negotiations, layout planning, etc.) were conducted based on incomplete information.

10. Less effort to ensure arrival of the missing kit item. Not applicable in the case: the employees were very keen on the missing information.
Practical implications

• **Wait until the information is complete!**
  – Does not mean that you have to have all information, but the information that is needed to accomplish the tasks!!!

• In lean construction, *making-do* is removed by a method called Last Planner ©
Conclusions

• Demonstration shows that making-do was evident in the case service process.
  – The activities were started without complete information and thus a great deal of waste was generated.

  ➔ Making-do creates an illusion of effective working! (v. Do less, achieve more!)

• In the future, studies to remove making-do in the field of FM are needed.

Thank you!