In their paper, Morabito, Stohr, and Genc examine key issues associated with current and future implementations of business intelligence (BI). They review the literature and discover the growing importance and emerging issues associated with BI. In addition they examine these issues with an exploratory but detailed case study of organizations from a variety of industries and articulate a series of lessons learned. The major finding is that organizations are rapidly moving to an enterprise perspective on BI, but in an unsystematic way that leaves several opportunities by the wayside. The authors provide a prescription for the future of BI that they call enterprise intelligence (EI). EI is described in a framework that combines elements of hierarchy theory, organization modeling, and intellectual capital.

O’Neill’s paper notes that enterprises today continue to invest in business intelligence (BI) initiatives with the hope of providing a strategic advantage to their organizations. However, he notes that many of these initiatives are supporting the tactical goals of individual business units and not the strategic goals of the enterprise. The author determines that while this decentralized approach provides short-term gains, it creates an environment where information silos develop and the enterprise as a whole struggles to develop a single version of the truth when it comes to providing strategic information. Instead of this approach, O’Neill contends that enterprises looking to increase the returns on their business intelligence investments are and should be turning toward a centralized approach to BI that aligns with their overall strategic goals. At the core of the centralized approach is the business intelligence competency center (BICC). The purpose of this paper is to detail why the centralized BICC approach should be considered an essential component of all enterprise BI initiatives. The value provided by the BICC is illustrated as the scope and roles of the group are defined. Examining case studies of BICC implementations details the benefits realized by real world companies who have taken this approach. O’Neill concludes that the benefits of the centralized BICC far outweigh the deficiencies of the decentralized approach to an enterprise BI strategy.

Gann’s paper contends that while the potential benefits from BI are potentially substantial, organizations have struggled to successfully deploy it. He notes that BI applies myriad advanced techniques, performed by the firm’s Information Technology (IT) group, to fulfill the reporting, analysis, and decision-support needs of the Lines of Business. Gann suggests that two of the greatest challenges in BI are accurately and continuously communicating requirements from the business to IT and quickly yet affordably delivering the requested functionality from IT to the business. He argues that companies can overcome these challenges by embracing a prescribed set of Agile development methodologies for BI. This paper examines the history of selected systems development approaches, weighs the advantages and disadvantages of prevailing practices, and ultimately recommends a path forward to succeeding in BI through the application of Agile methodologies.
Sawyer’s paper argues that BI developers have failed to create applications suited for the common end-user and that they do not provide a conceptual roadmap to address these shortfalls. It is argued that BI’s impact on analyses and decision-making depends on the development of less complex applications. Research conducted for this paper finds that BI lacks a common definition and standard, that BI tools are too complex for the common user, and that a shortage of analytical literacy relevant to BI among business professionals is a barrier to BI adoption. The paper suggests that until BI analysis tools become more “human-centric, design-oriented” and less from a “technology-centric, engineering-oriented perspective”, BI will continue to fail in its objective to routinely improve business decision-making.

The final paper by Rahman, Rutz, and Akhter notes that traditional data warehouse projects follow a waterfall development model in which the project goes through distinct phases. Each phase must complete before the next one can commence. These phases include requirements gathering, design, development, testing, deployment and stabilization. The issue is that both business requirements and technology are complex in nature. The waterfall development model can easily take six to nine months or longer to fully implement a solution, and by then business as well as technology has often changed considerably. The result is usually disappointed stakeholders and frustrated development teams. The authors detail the agile development approach that implements projects in an iterative fashion. Also known as the sixty percent solution, the agile approach seeks to deliver more than half of the user requirements in the initial release, with refinements coming in a series of subsequent releases that are scheduled at regular intervals. The authors assert that the agile data warehousing approach greatly increases the likelihood of successful implementation on time and within budget. This article discusses agile development methodologies in data warehousing and business intelligence, implications of the agile methodology, managing changes in data warehouses given frequent change in business intelligence (BI) requirements, and demonstrates the impact of agility on the business.
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