

<b>Change Request Information</b> <i>(completed by PCR Requestor)</i>			
Requested by		Submitted By	
Name	Melissa Turner	Name	Melissa Turner
Phone	850-410-9024	Phone	850-410-9024
Email	melissa.turner@myfloridacfo.com	Email	melissa.turner@myfloridacfo.com
Title	Project Manager	Title	Project Manager
Requesting Department Name	Department of Financial Services	Date Requested	8/5/2019
PCR Need Description <i>(Include description of change, why it is needed, how it was discovered)</i>	<p>During the Fiscal Year planning activities, adjustments were requested to applicable Go/No-Go Decisions' dates, names, and acceptance criteria to better define the milestone transition. These changes will align Project design activities with organization interaction.</p> <p>The following requested update is to change the deliverable type/name:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change D127 – Production Support Strategy from a Major Project Deliverable to a Written Deliverable with the due date as set forth in the Project Schedule</li> <li>• Change the name of D65 – Demonstration of Final Standardized Business Processes to Interim Business Process Models and update the deliverable type from a Written Deliverable to a Major Project Deliverable with due date of January 6, 2020.</li> <li>• Change D66 – Chart of Accounts Design from a Written Deliverable to a Major Project Deliverable with due date of December 20, 2019.</li> </ul> <p>The following requested updates are to applicable Go/No-Go Decisions' dates, names, and acceptance criteria to clearly describe what the Go/No-Go Decision is accomplishing and to include the necessary Deliverables to accurately make the decision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjustments to D67 – Ready to Start Build Go/No-Go Decision                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Update name to D67 – Ready for RICEFW Build Go/No-Go Decision</li> <li>○ Add D64 – RICEFW Inventory to acceptance criteria</li> <li>○ Add D65 – Interim Business Process Models to acceptance criteria</li> <li>○ Add D66 – Chart of Accounts Design to acceptance criteria</li> <li>○ Move Acceptance Date from October 31, 2019 to February 28, 2020</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Adjustments to D108 - Pilot - Ready for Integration Testing Go/No-Go Decision                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Update name to D108 – Pilot – Ready for Interface and Conversion Testing Go/No-Go Decision</li> <li>○ Remove D64 – RICEFW Inventory from acceptance criteria</li> <li>○ Remove D65 – Interim Business Process Models from acceptance criteria</li> <li>○ Remove D66 – Chart of Accounts Design from acceptance criteria</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Adjustment to D156 – Ready to Deploy Go/No-Go Decision                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Remove D145 – Completion of Parallel/Comparison Testing from acceptance criteria</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Adjustment to D130 – Ready for User Acceptance Testing Go/No-Go Decision                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Add D145 – Completion of Parallel/Comparison Testing to acceptance criteria</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Adjustment to D187 – Agency Solution Confirmation – Ready to Start Build Go/No-Go Decision                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Update name to Agency Solution Confirmation – Ready to Start RICEFW Build Go/No-Go Decision</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Adjustment to D273 – Wave 3 – Ready to Start Build Go/No-Go Decision                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Update name to D273 Wave 3 – Ready to Start RICEFW Build Go/No-Go Decision</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Adjustment to D175 – Wave 1 – Ready for Integration Testing Go/No-Go Decision                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Update name to D175 – Wave 1 – Ready for Interface and Conversion Testing Go/No-Go Decision</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Adjustment to D258 – Wave 2 – Ready for Integration Testing Go/No-Go Decision                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Update name to D258 – Wave 2 – Ready for Interface and Conversion Testing Go/No-Go Decision</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Adjustment to D313 – Wave 3 – Ready for Integration Testing Go/No-Go Decision                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Update name to D313 – Wave 3 – Ready for Interface and Conversion Testing Go/No-Go Decision</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

Business Benefit/Justification <i>(Provide the tangible/intangible value(s) that support the for the Project's goals)</i>	The business benefit and justification of this PCR is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjust applicable Go/No-Go dates to better align design activities with agency interactions.</li> <li>Update the names of applicable Go/No-Go Decisions to clearly describe what the Go/No-Go Decisions accomplish.</li> <li>Update the acceptance criteria of applicable Go/No-Go Decisions to include the necessary Deliverables to accurately inform the decision and to better align Deliverables with design and agency interactions activities.</li> </ul>																									
Implications of Not Making the Change <i>(If we do nothing, what is our "Impact Prediction" to the project in terms of risk or issue)</i>	If the PCR is not implemented, Go/No-Go Decisions' dates may drive acceptance of Deliverables that do not include information obtained from agency interactions which could impact the design and development. In addition, if the applicable Go/No-Go Decisions' acceptance criteria is not updated, then Go/No-Go Decisions could be approved without the inclusion of Deliverables that have an impact on the subsequent activity. Go/No-Go Decisions' name updates are required to better define what Decisions are accomplishing. All of these factors could also cause potential risk for rework or new development work late in the Project timeline.																									
Project Goals <i>(Please choose all that apply)</i>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Goal</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Reduce the State's risk exposure by harnessing modern financial management technology built on the premises of scalability, flexibility, and maintainability</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Improve state and agency specific decision making by capturing a consistent and an expandable set of data</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Improve the State's financial management capabilities to enable more accurate oversight of budget and cash demands today and, in the future,</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Improve staff productivity, reduce operational complexity and increase internal controls by enabling standardization and automation of business processes within and between DFS and agencies</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Goal		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reduce the State's risk exposure by harnessing modern financial management technology built on the premises of scalability, flexibility, and maintainability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Improve state and agency specific decision making by capturing a consistent and an expandable set of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	Improve the State's financial management capabilities to enable more accurate oversight of budget and cash demands today and, in the future,	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Improve staff productivity, reduce operational complexity and increase internal controls by enabling standardization and automation of business processes within and between DFS and agencies													
Goal																										
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reduce the State's risk exposure by harnessing modern financial management technology built on the premises of scalability, flexibility, and maintainability																									
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improve state and agency specific decision making by capturing a consistent and an expandable set of data																									
<input type="checkbox"/>	Improve the State's financial management capabilities to enable more accurate oversight of budget and cash demands today and, in the future,																									
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Improve staff productivity, reduce operational complexity and increase internal controls by enabling standardization and automation of business processes within and between DFS and agencies																									
<b>Initial Review</b> <i>(completed by PMO Team)</i>																										
PCR Title	Fiscal Year Planning ESC																									
Initial Review Date	8/16/2019	PCR ID	31																							
<b>PCR Historical Information</b> <i>Please enter the following IDs from the Project SharePoint logs (when applicable)</i>																										
Decision ID	Enter Decision ID	Decision Name	Enter Decision Name																							
Risk ID		Risk Name	Enter Risk Name																							
Issue ID	Enter Issue ID	Issue Name	Enter Issue Name																							
<b>Impact Analysis</b> <i>(completed by Florida PALM Project team members)</i>																										
PCR Analysis Resources	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th> <th>Role</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Melissa Turner</td><td>Project Director</td></tr> <tr><td>Matt Cole</td><td>BPS Track Manager</td></tr> <tr><td>Angie Robertson</td><td>BPS Track Manager</td></tr> <tr><td>Jason Shiver</td><td>SDS Track Manager</td></tr> <tr><td>Yesenia Reyes</td><td>OCM Track Manager</td></tr> <tr><td>Carolyn Hicks</td><td>OCM Track Manager</td></tr> <tr><td>Rachael Lieblich</td><td>PMO Track Manager</td></tr> <tr><td>Daymon Jensen</td><td>PMO Track Manager</td></tr> <tr><td>Paul Lavery</td><td>Project Manager</td></tr> <tr><td>Danielle Kosberg</td><td>Deputy Project Director</td></tr> <tr><td>Brian Cliburn</td><td>Deputy Project Manager</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Name	Role	Melissa Turner	Project Director	Matt Cole	BPS Track Manager	Angie Robertson	BPS Track Manager	Jason Shiver	SDS Track Manager	Yesenia Reyes	OCM Track Manager	Carolyn Hicks	OCM Track Manager	Rachael Lieblich	PMO Track Manager	Daymon Jensen	PMO Track Manager	Paul Lavery	Project Manager	Danielle Kosberg	Deputy Project Director	Brian Cliburn	Deputy Project Manager	
Name	Role																									
Melissa Turner	Project Director																									
Matt Cole	BPS Track Manager																									
Angie Robertson	BPS Track Manager																									
Jason Shiver	SDS Track Manager																									
Yesenia Reyes	OCM Track Manager																									
Carolyn Hicks	OCM Track Manager																									
Rachael Lieblich	PMO Track Manager																									
Daymon Jensen	PMO Track Manager																									
Paul Lavery	Project Manager																									
Danielle Kosberg	Deputy Project Director																									
Brian Cliburn	Deputy Project Manager																									
Tier Specification	<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="radio"/> Tier 1 (Project Director Approval Required)</td> <td><input checked="" type="radio"/> Tier 2 (ESC Approval Required)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Scope</td> <td>Changes that do not relate to additions or deletion of Business Requirements</td> <td>Addition or deletion of Business Requirements</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Schedule</td> <td>Changes not associated with Major Project Deliverables or Go/No-Go Decision due dates</td> <td>Changes to Major Project Deliverables or Go/No-Go Decision due dates</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cost</td> <td>Changes within budgeted Spend Plan categories and no overall Project cost overrun</td> <td>Results in request for funds from the Legislative Budget Committee (LBC)</td> </tr> </table>				<input type="radio"/> Tier 1 (Project Director Approval Required)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Tier 2 (ESC Approval Required)	Scope	Changes that do not relate to additions or deletion of Business Requirements	Addition or deletion of Business Requirements	Schedule	Changes not associated with Major Project Deliverables or Go/No-Go Decision due dates	Changes to Major Project Deliverables or Go/No-Go Decision due dates	Cost	Changes within budgeted Spend Plan categories and no overall Project cost overrun	Results in request for funds from the Legislative Budget Committee (LBC)											
	<input type="radio"/> Tier 1 (Project Director Approval Required)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Tier 2 (ESC Approval Required)																								
Scope	Changes that do not relate to additions or deletion of Business Requirements	Addition or deletion of Business Requirements																								
Schedule	Changes not associated with Major Project Deliverables or Go/No-Go Decision due dates	Changes to Major Project Deliverables or Go/No-Go Decision due dates																								
Cost	Changes within budgeted Spend Plan categories and no overall Project cost overrun	Results in request for funds from the Legislative Budget Committee (LBC)																								

Alternatives to Making the Change <i>(Describe solution options to fulfilling the change request)</i>	Viable <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	As-Is Project Schedule Alternative The Project can continue with the current Go/No-Go schedule and acceptance criteria. However, this has potential risks as described in Risk Associated with Not Making the Change Section below.		
	Viable <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Maintain deliverable type for D65 – Interim Business Process Models and D66 – Chart of Accounts Design. This has potential risks as described in Risk Associated with Not Making the Change Section below.		
Risk(s) Associated with Making the Change	Risk Category	Changes to the Go/No-Go Decisions will require significant updates to the Project Schedule, as well as a contract amendment will be required.		
	Project Management			
	Select			
Risk(s) Associated with NOT Making the Change	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Risk in quality of Go/No-Go Decisions due to incomplete information. Risk that Solution design will not include ESC consideration.		
Is Contract Affected?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Contract amendment will be required.		
Is Critical Path Affected?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Go/No-Go Decisions are a critical path milestone.		
Project Schedule Impact		Go/No-Go Decisions dates and acceptance criteria will need to be adjusted which will require a contract amendment and ESC approval.		
High - Impact to Go/No-Go Decisions is one to four weeks				
Project Scope Impact				
Low - No adjustment to Scope				
Project Cost Impact				
Moderate - Impact within budgeted Spend Plan and does not result in overall Project cost overruns				
Implementation Plan <i>(document name)</i>		Enter Document Name		
Additional Resource Requirements <i>(insert rows as needed)</i>		Hours Effort	Hours Cost	Cost
Enter Resource Name		Enter Number of Hours	Enter Cost Per Hour	Enter Total Cost
Enter Resource Name		Enter Number of Hours	Enter Cost Per Hour	Enter Total Cost
Enter Resource Name		Enter Number of Hours	Enter Cost Per Hour	Enter Total Cost
Enter Resource Name		Enter Number of Hours	Enter Cost Per Hour	Enter Total Cost
Totals		Enter Total Number of Hours	Enter Total Cost Per Hour	Enter Total Cost

<b>CCB Recommendation</b> <i>(completed by Department PMO)</i>			
CCB Members Approved	Final CCB Recommendation	CCB Approval Date	Choose a Date
<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Project Director <input type="checkbox"/> BPS Track Manager <input type="checkbox"/> OCM Track Manager <input type="checkbox"/> PMO Track Manager <input type="checkbox"/> SDS Track Manager	Choose an Item	Comments	
		CCB Comments	
<b>Authorization</b>			

This PROJECT CHANGE REQUEST is bound to the signed Project Charter and/or Contract Statement of Work and the PCR approval date. The following signatures authorize work described herein to be performed.

**TIER 1**

**TIER 2** *(when applicable)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Melissa Turner, PMP, FCCM  
Florida PALM Project Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Ryan West, Chair  
Florida PALM Executive Steering Committee