

ROGER MCNULTY

Business Systems Analyst, IT & Security

PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO | 2026

CORE COMPETENCIES

Requirements Engineering in Regulated Environments
System Dependency and Workflow Analysis
Operational Risk Reduction and Continuity Planning
Configuration and Change Enablement
IT Service Management and Compliance Alignment

QUALIFICATIONS & EDUCATION

Top Secret Clearance
ECBA (In Progress)
MBA – Business Analytics (In Progress)

Purpose of This Portfolio:

This portfolio presents my work supporting IT and Security organizations in regulated and classified environments. The materials demonstrate how I clarify requirements, document undocumented systems, reduce operational risk, and support-controlled change in mission-critical programs.

All company names, system identifiers, and sensitive details have been anonymized to protect confidentiality. Each case study reflects real analytical and operational work performed in defense and regulated settings, with a focus on continuity, compliance, and risk management rather than visibility or scale.

How to Use This Portfolio:

This portfolio is designed for hiring managers, technical leaders, and IT & Security partners who want to understand how I operate in high-consequence environments. It includes:

Case studies show how I translate business and operational needs into clear system requirements, map dependencies, eliminate single points of failure, and support disciplined change in regulated programs.

Selected artifacts that demonstrate documentation quality, requirements clarity, and continuity planning, including SOPs, workflow diagrams, user stories, and risk-aware process models.

The portfolio can be reviewed sequentially or referenced selectively based on role focus, whether that is requirements engineering, service management, system behavior analysis, or compliance-driven process improvement.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| About Me | 2 |
| Project Index | 4 |
| Project Case Studies | |
| Case Study 1: IT Service Impact Analysis | 5 |
| Case Study 2: Data Center Dependency Mapping | 7 |
| Case Study 3: Asset Management And Audit Readiness | 9 |
| Case Study 4: Asset Management And Audit Readiness | 11 |
| Case Study 4: Legacy Sme Knowledge Capture | 13 |
| Case Study 5: CMDB Modernization | 15 |
| Exhibits & Artifacts | |
| Exhibit A — Service Impact & Capacity Analysis..... | 17 |
| Exhibit B — System Shutdown & Startup Operations Guide..... | 18 |
| Exhibit C — Continuity & Knowledge Transfer Framework..... | 19 |
| Exhibit D — CMDB User Stories, Use Cases & Requirements..... | 22 |
| Exhibit E — Program Tracker / Project Tracking System | 23 |

About Me



I specialize in bringing structure to complex, regulated systems where continuity, compliance, and security cannot be compromised. My work centers on documenting what is undocumented, clarifying ownership where it is unclear, and partnering with engineering and cybersecurity teams to reduce operational risk and make change safer.

Across defense and enterprise IT environments, I have supported mission-critical systems by mapping dependencies, reverse-engineering legacy workflows, and formalizing procedures that previously relied on tribal knowledge. This approach strengthens audit readiness, improves service reliability, and ensures that modernization efforts do not introduce unnecessary exposure.

My background includes military leadership and years of experience in classified environments, which shape a disciplined, detail-oriented approach to business systems analysis. I focus on being a trusted partner to IT and Security leadership, translating business priorities into clear requirements and helping organizations deploy compliant, resilient, and sustainable capabilities.

| Detail | Description |
|----------------------|---|
| Education | MBA – Business Analytics (in progress) |
| Primary Focus | Infrastructure and operations analysis Requirements gathering in regulated environments Risk identification and continuity planning Process documentation and workflow modeling Configuration and change management support |

Business Analysis Competency Summary

My experience as a Business Systems Analyst has been shaped by work in classified and highly regulated environments where clarity, accuracy, and reliability are essential.

Requirements Engineering

I gather and validate business and system requirements through stakeholder interviews, workflow observation, and technical analysis. I document functional and non-functional requirements using BRDs, FRDs, user stories, and acceptance criteria to support controlled, predictable development.

Systems and Workflow Analysis

I reverse-engineer undocumented processes, map end-to-end workflows, and analyze system dependencies to expose risk, clarify constraints, and support modernization decisions.

Process Documentation and Continuity

I develop SOPs, lifecycle guides, and system maps that eliminate reliance on tribal knowledge and support training, sustainment, and operational readiness.

Testing and Validation

I support functional testing and User Acceptance Testing to ensure system changes meet operational and security requirements before deployment.

Service Management and Improvement

I apply IT service management principles to incident, change, and continuity practices, helping organizations improve reliability while maintaining compliance and security posture.

Cross-Functional Collaboration

I work closely with engineering, cybersecurity, operations, facilities, and leadership teams to ensure shared understanding and alignment across technical and non-technical stakeholders.

Project Index

IT Service Impact Analysis

System Dependency Mapping for Data Center Operations

Asset Management Workflow Redesign for Compliance and Accountability

Legacy System Knowledge Capture and Continuity Planning

CMDB Modernization, Requirements and Workflow Modeling

Selected artifacts include SOPs, dependency diagrams, requirements packages, user stories, and continuity documentation that demonstrate disciplined analysis in regulated environments.

Case Study 1: IT Service Impact Analysis



Project Overview

Evaluated a proposed endpoint-management automation initiative in a regulated IT environment to assess long-term service sustainability, cybersecurity exposure, and workforce impact. The objective was to support IT & Security leadership with a risk-aware, ITIL-aligned analysis that ensured modernization improved service delivery without introducing hidden operational or compliance risk.

| Approach | Details |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Requirements elicitation | Partnered with engineering, cybersecurity, and service owners to clarify functional needs, security constraints, and long-term support expectations. |
| Service impact analysis | Assessed the proposal through the lens of IT service management, focusing on change enablement, service continuity, and operational resilience rather than feature delivery alone. |
| Capacity and workforce assessment | Analyzed long-term maintenance and support requirements to understand FTE impact, technical debt accumulation, and sustainability of the proposed solution. |

| Approach | Details |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Option comparison | Evaluated alternative implementation approaches, including a lean scripting model that preserved functionality while reducing complexity and security exposure. |
| Decision-support documentation | Translated technical risk into operational impact through a structured briefing for IT & Security leadership, supporting informed, risk-balanced decision making. |

| Outcome |
|---------|
|---------|

- Enabled IT & Security leadership to make a risk-informed modernization decision balancing efficiency with long-term service sustainability.
- Supported a pivot to a solution that met operational needs while reducing maintenance burden and cybersecurity exposure.
- Strengthened alignment between service delivery goals and security posture.
- Reinforced disciplined change governance using ITIL-aligned service impact analysis.

| Key Deliverables |
|------------------|
|------------------|

- Service Impact & Risk Assessment Summary
- Capacity and Workforce Impact Analysis
- Comparative Implementation Options Matrix
- Change Enablement & Risk Considerations Brief

Supporting documentation for this procedure is provided in Exhibit A.

Case Study 2: Data Center Dependency Mapping



Project Overview

Analyzed and documented the shutdown and startup dependencies of a classified data center environment to eliminate tribal knowledge, reduce operational and hardware risk, and establish a standardized, repeatable workflow across engineering, cybersecurity, operations, and facilities teams.

| Approach | Details |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Requirements elicitation | Interviewed engineering, cyber, operations, and facilities teams to identify technical dependencies, functional constraints, and non-functional requirements (data integrity, safety, timing). |
| Workflow modeling | Reverse-engineered undocumented steps and developed clear workflow and dependency diagrams illustrating system relationships and required pre-conditions. |

| Approach | Details |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Gap analysis | Identified inconsistencies in execution, lack of documentation, and risk caused by sequence variation across teams. |
| Process documentation | Authored standardized SOPs and a condensed sequencing checklist to ensure repeatable, auditable execution. |
| Cross-functional alignment | Facilitated validation sessions with engineers and cyber teams to confirm sequence accuracy and risk controls. |

| Outcome |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eliminated reliance on tribal knowledge through clear, system-focused documentation. ▪ Reduced hardware and data-integrity risk during maintenance events. ▪ Improved communication and shared understanding across all technical teams. ▪ Established a repeatable, approved workflow supporting future modernization efforts. |

| Key Deliverables |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shutdown/Startup SOP ▪ Sequencing Checklist ▪ System Dependency Diagram ▪ Risk & Control Summary <p data-bbox="367 1700 1158 1742"><i>Supporting documentation for this procedure is provided in Exhibit B.</i></p> |

Case Study 3: Asset Management and Audit Readiness



Project Overview

Led requirements gathering and functional analysis to support a cost-efficient modernization of end-user devices across a distributed enterprise environment. The goal was to reduce long-term hardware costs, improve reliability, and ensure device selections aligned with operational needs.

| Approach | Details |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Requirements elicitation | Interviewed administrators, faculty, and technical staff to identify workflows, performance expectations, application needs, and usability requirements. |
| Functional evaluation | Compared device models based on lifespan, maintenance requirements, compatibility with enterprise tools, and user experience feedback. |
| Workflow assessment | Analyzed current provisioning and onboarding processes to determine |

| Approach | Details |
|----------------------|--|
| Documentation | Produced clear deployment workflows, readiness checklists, and user onboarding materials to standardize rollout and reduce support demand. |

| Outcome |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduced total cost of ownership through targeted device selection informed by functional requirements and lifecycle analysis. ▪ Improved end-user reliability and performance by aligning device capabilities with real operational needs. ▪ Standardized provisioning and onboarding workflows, decreasing downtime and ensuring consistent adoption across the organization. ▪ Enhanced transparency for leadership through concise cost-benefit documentation and recommendations. |

| Key Deliverables |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Functional Requirements Summary ▪ Cost Comparison & Analysis Report ▪ Deployment Workflow Diagram ▪ End-User Onboarding Guides |

Case Study 4: Asset Management and Audit Readiness



Project Overview

Conducted a full assessment and redesign of asset management workflows across storage, shipping/receiving, and tracking functions. The objective was to restore accountability, improve audit readiness, eliminate undocumented processes, and create a scalable, standardized asset lifecycle model supporting mission-critical IT infrastructure.

| Approach | Details |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Requirements elicitation | Engaged infrastructure, operations, logistics, security, and program teams to identify pain points, compliance needs, lifecycle gaps, and system constraints. |
| Workflow analysis | Mapped as-is processes for intake, tagging, reconciliation, storage, staging, and shipping to identify inefficiencies, bottlenecks, and points of failure. |
| Product redesign | Developed to-be workflows that improved traceability, clarified responsibilities, aligned |

| Approach | Details |
|---|--|
| Documentation | <p>cross-team handoffs, and supported compliance requirements.</p> |
| Asset Lifecycle improvement | <p>Created SOPs, process maps, lifecycle models, and reconciliation tools to eliminate reliance on tribal knowledge and ensure consistent execution.</p> |
| Outcome | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Established clear, standardized end-to-end asset processes used across multiple teams. ▪ Improved accuracy and audit readiness through reliable lifecycle tracking and documentation. ▪ Reduced risk tied to undocumented workflows and single-person SME reliance. ▪ Enhanced operational coordination and reduced processing timelines. ▪ Provided leadership with visibility into inventory status and workflow performance. | |
| Key Deliverables | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Asset Management Lifecycle Workflow Maps ▪ Centralized Asset Tracking Register ▪ Shipping & Receiving SOP ▪ Workspace Organization & Labeling System | |
| <p><i>Supporting documentation for this procedure is provided in Exhibit B.</i></p> | |

Case Study 4: Legacy SME Knowledge Capture



Project Overview

Captured undocumented system knowledge and reconstructed operational logic for a legacy, mission-critical environment previously dependent on single-point SMEs. The goal was to analyze system behavior, document command sequences, and create clear reference materials enabling sustainment, onboarding, and continuity for future technical staff.

| Approach | Details |
|------------------------------|---|
| Knowledge extraction | Conducted structured interviews and shadow sessions with outgoing SMEs to capture operational steps, system logic, dependencies, and critical nuances not documented elsewhere. |
| System logic analysis | Reverse-engineered workflows and command sequences to clarify what the system does, why specific steps are required, and how components interact. |

| Approach | Details |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Workflow documentation | Developed detailed, step-by-step procedures and high-level logic diagrams describing data flow, system triggers, and operational states. |
| Risk identification | Analyzed failure modes related to incorrect sequencing, missing prerequisites, or improper parameter use; defined controls to mitigate operator error. |
| Training enablement | Produced onboarding materials and process explanations enabling new engineers to understand, operate, and troubleshoot the system safely and consistently. |

| Outcome |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eliminated reliance on tribal knowledge linked to retiring SMEs. ▪ Improved sustainment readiness by providing engineering-grade documentation. ▪ Reduced operational risk by clarifying required sequencing, dependencies, and failure points. ▪ Enabled faster, more structured onboarding for new analysts and engineers. ▪ Strengthened continuity planning across classified programs. |

| Key Deliverables |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ System Logic Diagram & Dependency Map ▪ Operator Workflow Guide ▪ SME Knowledge Capture Notes ▪ Risk / Failure Mode Summary |

Supporting documentation for this procedure is provided in Exhibit C.

Case Study 5: CMDB Modernization



Project Overview

Led business and system requirements gathering for the modernization of a cross-functional Configuration Management Database (CMDB). The existing process lacked clarity, produced inconsistent data, and caused friction between infrastructure, operations, and cybersecurity teams. The objective was to define structured requirements, model workflows, and create documentation to support a scalable CMDB redesign aligned with enterprise workflows.

| Approach | Details |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Stakeholder interviews | Engaged engineering, operations, cybersecurity, asset management, and ITSM teams to understand pain points, data inconsistencies, and required capabilities. |
| Requirements engineering | Documented functional requirements, non-functional requirements, user roles, data fields, validation rules, and integration expectations. |
| User story development | Created clear user stories, acceptance criteria, and data-flow considerations to support backlog refinement and development planning. |

| Approach | Details |
|--|--|
| Gap analysis Cross-functional alignment Documentation | <p>Built current-state and future-state diagrams illustrating intake, lifecycle updates, attribute validation, approval pathways, and system dependencies.</p> <p>Identified breakdowns in data accuracy, hand-off ambiguity, and inconsistencies between teams entering or consuming CMDB data.</p> <p>Produced conceptual data models, process maps, and requirements packages used to design a more structured and reliable CMDB.</p> |
| Outcome | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Established a unified requirements baseline across all contributing teams. ▪ Improved data quality expectations through defined validation logic and ownership responsibilities. ▪ Provided development teams with actionable requirements, reducing ambiguity and rework. ▪ Enabled consistent lifecycle tracking and audit-ready data for compliance and reporting. ▪ Strengthened cross-team communication by clarifying workflow interactions and system behavior. | |

Supporting documentation for this procedure is provided in Exhibit D.

Exhibit A — Service Impact & Capacity Analysis

This exhibit documents the analytical artifacts used to support a risk-informed modernization decision for an endpoint-management initiative in a regulated IT environment. The materials demonstrate how IT service management principles were applied to evaluate service sustainability, cybersecurity exposure, and long-term support impact before authorizing change.

Rather than focusing solely on cost efficiency, the exhibit reflects a governance-aligned approach that balances capacity planning, technical debt, and compliance posture to ensure modernization strengthens service delivery without introducing operational risk.

| Analysis Metric | Proposed | Recommendation | Delta / Variance |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Development Time | 320 Hours (8 Weeks) | 40 Hours (1 Week) | -87.5% Time-to-Value |
| FTE Overhead (Annual) | 0.25 FTE (Maintenance/Sec) | 0.05 FTE (Updates) | 80% Lower Labor Debt |
| Tech Debt / Complexity | High (Custom Integration) | Low (Native Scripting) | Lower Risk Profile |
| Cybersecurity Risk | Significant (New Attack Surface) | Negligible (Standard Controls) | Compliance Alignment |
| Estimated Year 1 ROI | -14% (Negative ROI) | +210% (High Yield) | Strategic Pivot Justified |

Exhibit B — System Shutdown & Startup Operations Guide

This exhibit provides a detailed technical procedure guide outlining the safe shutdown and startup sequence for the environment. The document captures system dependencies, hardware preparation steps, credential validation, risk-mitigation tasks, and the correct order of operations for powering down and restoring a multi-system architecture.

1. Shutdown Procedure: Critical Sequence

Prerequisites

- All necessary approvals from IT Operations, Cyber Security, DevSecOps and Infrastructure teams have been received before the shutdown process begins.
- Ensure the IP addresses and administrator credentials for the Primary Storage Array, Virtualization Management Cluster (VMC), and all Hypervisors are validated.
- Confirm that all administrative passwords work correctly prior to initiating the shutdown.
- Physically log in to the Primary Storage Array and Hypervisor consoles to verify current status.

Pre-Shutdown Actions

1. SNAPSHOTS

Log in to the VMC and perform snapshots of ALL applicable virtual machines. Verify snapshots performed successfully.

2. AUTOMATED SHUTDOWN

Schedule the Automated Client Shutdown Package to shut down all production workstations. Ensure the package includes a 15-minute timer. Crucially, ensure any administrator workstations are excluded from the package list.

3. AUTO POWER-ON CHECK

Verify the Domain Controller, Application Server, and VMC VM are set to automatically power on in the event of power loss. (*If not set, they must be manually powered on via the Hypervisor console*).

Phase 1: Virtual Machine (VM) Shutdown

1. Power Down UNSUPPORTED VMs

Log in to the VMC and power down ALL Test/Development/Unsupported virtual machines (RMB, use the shutdown guest OS option).

2. Power Down Production VMs

Exhibit C — Continuity & Knowledge Transfer Framework

A sample snapshot of the internal tracking board used to document and validate inherited tasks across various systems. This artifact demonstrates the level of detail required to ensure continuity during knowledge transfer and minimize single-point-of-failure risk.

| Process Documentation Task Tracker | | | | |
|--|---|---------|---|--|
| Task | Status | Urgency | Notes | |
| Daily | | | | |
| Monitor Legacy Mainframe Login Failures and unauthorized access attempts. | 🟡 | Yellow | SOP for escalating security events and unlocking accounts. | |
| Check Critical Error Log (CEL) for the Tier 1 Inventory Processing Application for anomalies. | 🟡 | Yellow | SOP for diagnosing common application errors (e.g., memory overflow, service failure). | |
| Verify Real-Time Data Replication Health between the primary server and the standby failover node. | 🟢 | Yellow | Runbook for diagnosing replication latency or failure scenarios. | |
| Confirm scheduled End-of-Day (EOD) Batch Jobs (e.g., inventory reconciliation) completed successfully. | 🔵 | Yellow | Checklist for validating EOD output reports and restart procedures. | |
| Weekly | | | | |
| Review System Backup Integrity (check log success, perform random test restores) for the legacy database. | 🔴 | Green | SOP detailing the weekly tape rotation, offsite transfer, and test restoration procedure. | |
| Audit User Access Changes and security group modifications made in the legacy system during the previous week. | 🟡 | Green | Procedure for reviewing access logs, validating changes against approved tickets, and revoking unauthorized access. | |
| Prepare and distribute Weekly Performance Metrics Report on CPU, memory, and disk utilization to IT leadership. | 🟢 | Green | Template for the weekly report format, data extraction method, and distribution list. | |
| Clean up temporary files, perform disk defragmentation, and archive non-critical system logs older than 90 days. | 🟢 | Green | Runbook for log archiving commands and approved storage location. | |
| Monthly | | | | |
| Analyze Capacity Trends (database size, storage usage) and forecast resource needs for the next 6-12 months. | 🟢 | Red | Methodology document for capacity forecasting and procurement request submission. | |
| Review and update the Disaster Recovery (DR) Plan for the legacy environment (e.g., contact lists, restoration sequence). | 🔴 | Red | SOP for annual review cycle and procedure for executing the DR failover test (e.g., running the OS image on a virtual machine). | |
| Conduct Vulnerability and Patch Management Review and coordinate with operations to apply critical OS/application patches. | 🟡 | Red | Procedure for patch testing in the development environment and scheduling production deployment windows. | |
| Validate Operational Runbooks and System Diagrams for accuracy against the current production environment configuration. | 🟢 | Red | Checklist for validating system documentation and submitting corrections to the centralized knowledge base. | |
| ✓ = Completed | 🟡 = In Progress | | Low | |
| ● = Ready for Review | ○ = Pending / Not Assigned | | Medium | |
| ● = On Hold | ● = Not Yet Started | | High | |

This Project Charter provides the foundational scope and business justification for the Legacy Platform Knowledge Capture Initiative. As an artifact, it demonstrates your ability to structure complex projects by formally defining objectives, key deliverables, and detailed scope (including what is out-of-scope). Furthermore, it highlights competence in risk management by identifying operational risks, such as single-point-of-failure dependency, and formally outlining the necessary mitigation strategies to ensure system continuity and operational stability.

PROJECT CHARTER

Project Purpose / Business Need

Critical operational and troubleshooting knowledge for the Legacy Computing Platform resides with a limited number of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs). Many essential tasks are currently executed via undocumented procedures and ad-hoc troubleshooting. This creates high operational risk, slows system recovery times, and creates an unhealthy dependency on individuals rather than standard processes.

The project exists to capture, formalize, and transition this critical SME knowledge into documented, repeatable, and auditable processes, ensuring system continuity and readiness for core enterprise operations.

Project Objectives

1. Identify and capture all routine and on-demand system maintenance tasks performed by current SME staff.
2. Develop complete, accurate, and standardized process documentation for the platform's core operations.
3. Establish a repeatable onboarding and knowledge-transfer framework for future maintainers.
4. Reduce single-point-of-failure risk and increase system stability.
5. Enable support scalability and improve training efficiency for support personnel.
6. Provide leadership with objective visibility into system support readiness and risk profile.

Scope Definition

In Scope

- Inventory of all tasks performed by SME staff across the platform's subsystems.
- Documentation of all task frequencies (daily, weekly, monthly, on-demand)
- Review of logs, system close-out procedures, and routine reports.
- Development of SOPs, runbooks, and step-by-step guides.
- Creation of exhibits (task tracker, process flow diagrams, knowledge maps)
- Formal transition of responsibilities from existing SME to new maintainers.

Out of Scope

- Hardware refresh or system modernization activities.
- Software rewrite or migration off the Legacy Computing Platform.
- Deep security remediation beyond documentation alignment.
- Any changes to program funding outside of this knowledge initiative.

This presentation outlines a structured SME transition and task-documentation initiative designed to capture, standardize, and transfer legacy system responsibilities. It highlights current risks, defines the scope of daily through annual workflows, and presents a phased 12–24-month roadmap to ensure continuity, reduce single-point-of-failure exposure, and strengthen long-term operational support.



AGENDA

- CURRENT STATE: WHERE WE ARE TODAY
- WHY THIS INITIATIVE MATTERS
- SCOPE OF WORK: TASK DOCUMENTATION OVERVIEW
- ROADMAP: NEXT 12–24 MONTHS
- METRICS & REPORTING: HOW WE'LL SHOW VALUE
- CALL TO ACTION & NEXT STEPS



ROADMAP: NEXT 12–24 MONTHS

- **PHASE 1 (0-3 MONTHS):** CAPTURE AND DOCUMENT HIGH-FREQUENCY TASKS (DAILY/WEEKLY)
- **PHASE 2 (3-12 MONTHS):** DOCUMENT MONTHLY/YEARLY/ON-DEMAND TASKS; TRANSFER OWNERSHIP
- **PHASE 3 (12-24 MONTHS):** OPERATIONALIZE SME ROLE: MONITORING, REPORTING, CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT
- REGULAR STAKEHOLDER REVIEWS (MONTHLY UPDATES, QUARTERLY DEEP DIVES)



Exhibit D — CMDB User Stories, Use Cases & Requirements

This exhibit compiles the user stories, acceptance criteria, and requirements that shaped the CMDB modernization POC. Drawn from stakeholder workshops and operational gap analysis, the materials outline improvements to baseline management, inventory tracking, lifecycle visibility, project workflow integration, and capital-asset governance.

| ID | Feature | User Story | Acceptance Criteria | Priority |
|--------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| REQ-01 | Inventory Lifecycle Management | As a Software Asset Manager, I want the ability to include End-of-Life (EOL) data for software baselines in the Configuration Database, so that I can proactively manage software lifecycle, plan upgrades, and maintain compliance. | The CMDB administrator can add and update EOL data for all recorded software baselines. The EOL date must be selected from a date-picker or dropdown menu to ensure consistent data format and reduce entry errors. | High  |
| REQ-02 | Data Management and Usability | As an IT Asset Manager, I want the ability to perform bulk uploads of hardware and software data, so that I can efficiently populate and maintain the CMDB after large deployments or inventory refreshes. | A bulk upload feature is available for authorized users to upload data (e.g., CSV, Excel). Access controls are in place to restrict the feature to authorized personnel only. Validation checks are performed during the upload process to ensure data quality and consistency. A comprehensive log and audit trail is created for all bulk uploads. | Low  |
| REQ-03 | Financial and Project Governance | As an IT Asset Manager, I want the ability to perform bulk uploads of hardware and software data, so that I can efficiently populate and maintain the CMDB after large deployments or inventory refreshes. | A dedicated Capital ID field is available and distinct from the standard Asset Tag field. Immediate notifications (e.g., email alerts) are sent to designated Finance stakeholders whenever any change is made to a capital asset's status or location. Reports are available to view the status, location, and history of all capital assets based on their Capital ID. | Medium  |

Exhibit E — Program Tracker / Project Tracking System

This exhibit presents a comprehensive program-tracking system designed to improve accountability and communication across closed-area IT programs. Features include a timestamped working log, administrative procedures, troubleshooting guides, reference libraries, and new-hire onboarding modules. This centralized tracking approach reflects the Business Analyst's responsibility to enhance documentation quality, manage workflows, improve visibility for leadership, and streamline communication channels across technical and operational teams.

2

Introduction

A comprehensive OneNote solution for managing and tracking Program in Closed Areas

Key features:

- Working Log
- Administrative
- Procedures
- Troubleshooting
- References
- Checklists
- New Hires Information

The screenshot shows a OneNote page titled "General Issues / Fixes". The left sidebar contains a navigation menu with sections like "Add Page", "Drive Failures", "Account Creations", etc. The main content area has a title "General Issues and Fixes" and a sub-section "Issues and Fixes for LIBs". Below this is a note about updates to software/hardware. A table titled "Issue and Fixes" is displayed, showing various issues listed with possible solutions. The table has columns for "Issue Area", "Description of Issue", and "Solution/fix".

4

Existing Challenges

- Lack of centralized documentation and communication.
- Difficulty in tracking what tasks have been completed and by whom.
- Difficulty tracking task completion and accountability.
- Lack of visibility into program status and progress.
- Lack of accountability due to non-standardized task tracking.
- Poor communication between team members in closed areas.

