When using a project triangle to illustrate conflicting priorities, Microsoft suggests that if the problem is in the fixed leg, work on the other two legs. For example, if the project must not exceed the budget and it is starting to run over, adjust the schedule, or the scope, or both. However, if the problem is not related to the fixed leg, the adjustment might have to be in the remaining leg. So, when faced with an inflexible budget (fixed leg) and the schedule is slipping (problem leg), the project’s scope (remaining leg) might have to be adjusted.

Why is explaining this situation to management sometimes a very difficult task for the systems analyst?

The systems analyst plans to complete the whole project and that is what they wish to do. In this case that may not be possible since the cost is fixed, so that is not changing. The schedule changed for the worse, so that leg is unlikely to improve. The best option to get things on time would be to omit some feature or limit a process. This could look bad on the systems analyst and this is the type of news that management does not want to hear. This could also have a negative impact on the analysts reputation. Anything that goes wrong gets blamed on the project manager, whether its their fault or not.