

Stakeholder Analysis

Prepared for: OCM Lead, Project Lead & Executive Sponsor | Initiative: [REDACTED] | Assessment Date: [REDACTED]

SECTION 1 — STAKEHOLDER REGISTER

Trust level is AI-inferred as Low across this stakeholder population, driven by this organization's mixed change history, documented past resistance patterns, and current employee willingness scored as skepticism. Baseline trust is adjusted per group below; source signals are the organization's mixed change-adoption history, the historical resistance narrative provided, and the current willingness rating.

Group	Headcount	Impact	Nature of Impact	Journey Stage	Resistance Driver	Trust	Notes / Flags
Executive Leadership / Sponsor Layer	Not provided	—	Governance and accountability for the rollout	Interest forming	Low personal impact (removed from day-to-day tool use)	Mode rate	[REDACTED] is selectively involved; willing to communicate directly
People Managers / Team Leads	~700 (subset of Operations/Production)	High	Role responsibilities shifting; new coaching and monitoring responsibilities	Attention/Interest	Capability gap anxiety — minimally equipped to lead this change	Low	△ HIGH RESISTANCE given manager readiness gaps
Operations/Production — Contact Center & Branch Phone Service	19,800	High	New system/tool adoption; workflow changes; role responsibility changes	Attention/Interest	Job security concern	Low	△ HIGH RESISTANCE · △ DOMINANT GROUP (94% of in-scope population) · AI adoption creates a specific trust challenge — address before feature messaging
HR/People Org — Back-Office Documentation	350	High	Headcount/structural change (role redeployment)	Attention gap	Job security concern	Low	△ IDENTITY DISRUPTION · △ HIGH RESISTANCE

Group	Headcount	Impact	Nature of Impact	Journey Stage	Resistance Driver	Trust	Notes / Flags
on & Reconciliation (redeploying)			, no net job loss); role responsibility changes				
Legal & Compliance — QA/Compliance Monitoring Analysts	210	Medium	Policy/compliance changes; process changes to monitoring workflow	Interest forming	Information gap	Moderate	Embedded in build; closer to project information
Information Technology — Platform/Integration Engineers	640	Medium	Tool/system changes; new integration and support responsibilities	Interest forming	Low personal impact	Moderate	Embedded in build; closer to project information

Early stage — Attention must be established before any training activity begins for the two dominant frontline groups.

SECTION 2 — INFLUENCE / INTEREST / TRUST MATRIX

Group	Influence	Interest	Trust	Quadrant	Priority
Executive Leadership / Sponsor Layer	High	Medium	Moderate	Keep Satisfied — verify alignment before proceeding	1
People Managers / Team Leads	Medium	High	Low	Manage Closely — listening-first engagement required	2
Operations/Production Colleagues	Low	High	Low	Keep Informed — low trust amplifies resistance risk	3
HR/People Org Redeployment Team	Low	High	Low	Keep Informed — low trust amplifies resistance risk	4
Legal & Compliance	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Manage Closely — verify alignment before proceeding	5
Information Technology	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Manage Closely — verify alignment before proceeding	6

Trust level is AI-inferred from change history, past resistance patterns, culture signals, resistance source, and employee willingness. Source signals: Q10=B (mixed change history), Q29 (documented past resistance narrative present), Q19=2 (skepticism). Validate with project lead before finalizing engagement approach.

SECTION 3 — ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

People Managers / Team Leads (Priority 1)

Managers are prioritized first despite medium influence because their trust is Low and their capability gap is the largest lever in this initiative — employees will take their cues from managers before they take them from any corporate communication. The recommended approach is listening-first: a pre-training briefing that surfaces manager concerns directly rather than handing them a script to defend. Engagement cannot begin in earnest until the Manager Enablement Kit (D09) is finalized and managers have had a private forum to raise their own doubts. The specific constraint here is that managers are currently minimally equipped — briefing content must close capability gaps, not just deliver information.

Operations/Production Colleagues (Priority 2)

This group represents at least half of the in-scope population — 94% of in-scope headcount. It requires a dedicated engagement track: its own champion coverage across all 14 contact center hubs and six branch-service regions, targeted training sequencing, and group-specific communications, rather than a share of a uniform companywide program. Given Low trust and an active job-security resistance driver, engagement must open with the sponsor's direct employment-impact statement before any efficiency or benefit messaging. Sequencing here is the single highest-leverage decision in the entire program.

HR/People Org Redeployment Team (Priority 3)

This group carries the most concentrated identity-disruption risk in the assessment — their current role is being substantially automated and they are being redeployed into expanded servicing roles. Engagement must begin earliest of any group, ahead of the broader companywide announcement, so that these 350 colleagues are not learning about their own redeployment from a general company communication. The constraint here is sequencing, not content: the redeployment plan and role placements should be substantially resolved before this group is engaged, not announced as a concept to be worked out later.

Legal & Compliance and Information Technology (Priority 4-5)

Both groups are embedded in the build and carry Moderate trust and Medium influence. Engagement here is primarily coordination, not persuasion — confirming monitoring-policy language with Legal & Compliance and confirming support-model ownership with IT. Neither group requires the intensive listening-first approach the frontline groups need.

Executive Leadership / Sponsor Layer (Priority 6, but gating)

Although ranked last for active engagement effort, this group must be fully aligned before any other engagement proceeds — its priority number reflects effort required, not sequencing. [REDACTED] selective involvement pattern is workable given her willingness to communicate directly, but the leadership coalition beneath her needs a single aligned message before Priority 1 and 2 engagement begins.

The trust deficit identified across this stakeholder population is the single most significant engagement risk in this assessment. Messaging and training will not land until trust is established. The engagement sequence must prioritize listening and direct dialogue before any persuasive communication begins. The single highest-risk engagement gap is the combination of Low manager trust and Low manager capability in the group carrying 94% of the in-scope population — if managers are not equipped and aligned before broad communications launch, the entire engagement sequence collapses at its first link. In the next two weeks, the project team should schedule the manager listening sessions and finalize the sponsor's job-security statement, in that order.

Prepared by GOccelerate™ | [REDACTED] | Confidence: Very High (100%)

The GOccelerate People Risk Index (PRI) is a formative, expert-derived index of people and adoption risk across four dimensions — Leadership, Stakeholder, Capability, and Sustainment — grounded in established organizational change management practice. Dimension scores reflect equally weighted, normalized risk points assigned through expert judgment rather than statistically estimated weights. Baseline results derive from a structured intake completed by a single informant and reflect that respondent's knowledge of the organization at the time of assessment; the accompanying Data Confidence indicator reflects the completeness of the information provided. Risk bands are provisional and subject to recalibration as GOccelerate's outcome-validation program accumulates post-implementation adoption data.