

Change Request Form

Project:	<u>AHI App Development</u>	Change ID:	<u>0005</u>
Date Requested:	<u>1 Aug 20xx</u>	Requested By:	<u>Ram Samuels</u>
PM:	<u>Cary Manning</u>	Requestor Email:	<u>RamS@AHI.net</u>
Decision:	<u>Accepted</u> Accepted, Accepted with Modifications, Rejected, Deferred, Further Analysis Required	Decision Date:	<u>7 Aug 20xx</u>

Proposed Change: Detailed description. Focus on business needs, requirements; solution is secondary.

Two additional data feed sources have been identified. Request these data feeds be incorporated as inputs to the App. Preliminary review indicates these data feeds will add \$2500 to the project cost. Time to gain licensing and activation is estimated at two weeks.

Reason for Change: Focus on benefits that will accrue after the change is made. Describe why this change was not addressed earlier in the project. Who or what is driving this change?

The first data feed will provide advanced global sales data in the skin care product industry. In addition, updates are made weekly.

The second data feed will provide better demographic analytics to segment and position our products effectively.

Impact Analysis: Consider impact on work products, quality, schedule, scope, budget, people, resources, and other projects. List cost/benefit/ROI. Consider impacts on all groups and stakeholders. List assumptions, dependencies, and risks. Define approval levels.

Change Request Form

Impacts

- **Work Products:**
 - **Affected Deliverables**
 - **Documentation**
 - **Impact Severity: Moderate**
- **Quality:**
 - **Positive**
 - **Negative**
 - **Impact Severity: Low to Moderate**
- **Schedule**
 - **Delay**
 - **Third Sprint Dependency**
 - **Impact Severity: Moderate**
- **Scope:**
 - **Increase**
 - **Stakeholder Alignment**
 - **Impact Severity: Moderate**
- **Budget:**
 - **Cost**
 - **Prior Strain**
 - **Impact Severity: Low**
- **People:**
 - **Team Load**
 - **Training**
 - **Impact Severity: Moderate**
- **Resources:**
 - **IT Infrastructure**
 - **Licensing**
 - **Impact Severity: Low**
- **Other Projects:**
 - **Impact: Minimal**
 - **Opportunity: Repurposed hardware could support other AHI initiatives**
 - **Impact Severity: Low**

Cost/Benefit/ROI

- **Costs:**
 - **Direct: \$2,500 for data feed licenses.**

Change Request Form

- Indirect: ~80–100 hours integration/testing (~\$4,800–\$6,000 at \$60/hour, within Sprint 3 labor budget), ~10–20 hours training (~\$600–\$1,200).
- Total: ~\$3,100–\$4,700 (1.2–1.9% of \$250,000 budget).
- **Benefits:**
 - Tangible: Improved analytics increase market share by ~2–5% (O1, estimated based on enhanced segmentation/sales data), potentially adding \$50,000–\$100,000 in annual revenue (assuming \$2M baseline revenue, per industry context).
 - Intangible: Enhanced stakeholder satisfaction (Marketing, Leadership), stronger competitive positioning, reduced risk of v1 failure (R1, R6 mitigation).
- **ROI:**
 - Formula: $(\text{Benefit} - \text{Cost}) / \text{Cost} \times 100$.
 - Calculation: $(\$50,000 - \$4,700) / \$4,700 \times 100 \approx 964\%$ (conservative, first-year revenue gain).
 - Assessment: High ROI due to low cost and significant strategic benefits, assuming market share gains materialize.

Stakeholder Impacts

- **Leadership:** Benefits from improved segmentation (Data Feed 2), supporting O1 (market positioning), but risks frustration if reporting requirements remain unmet (Status Report).
- **Marketing:** Gains advanced sales data (Data Feed 1), enhancing competitive analysis, but requires training.
- **IT (Priya Service):** Increased workload for integration, but excess capacity eases resource strain.
- **Customers:** Indirect benefit from better-targeted products, no direct impact.
- **Finance:** Neutral; \$2,500 cost is minor, but monitors budget strain (hardware over-purchase, \$2,000 equipment).
- **Sponsor (Mary Smithers):** Supports strategic goals but concerned with schedule delays and scope creep.

Assumptions

- Licensing/activation takes exactly two weeks (10 working days), starting post-approval.
- Integration effort is ~80–100 hours, based on prior data feed tasks (Sprint 1).
- \$2,500 cost covers all licensing fees; no recurring costs.
- Third sprint is approved (per Status Report), providing capacity for integration.
- Excess IT capacity supports new feeds without additional hardware.

Change Request Form

Dependencies

- **Third Sprint Approval:** Integration requires Sprint 3; without it, delays.
- **Stakeholder Sign-Off:** Cal Hamer's requirement updates must align with new feeds.
- **Vendor Coordination:** Timely licensing/activation depends on external vendors.
- **Team Availability:** No significant flu season disruptions.

Risks

Risk ID	Description	Probability	Impact	Mitigation	Owner
R4	Data feed integration issues (e.g., API failures) delay WBS 2.1	Medium	High	Test APIs early in Sprint 3 (WBS 2.2); use alternative feeds if needed (\$5,000 budget)	Priya Service
R6	Scope creep from new feeds delays v1 delivery	Medium	High	Use CCB to prioritize feeds over non-critical requirements	Cary Manning
R2	Flu season reduces team availability	Low	Medium	Monitor health; cross-train team members	Cary Manning
New	Vendor delays in licensing/activation exceed two weeks	Low	Medium	Secure vendor commitment by June 7, 2025	Priya Service

Approval Levels

- **Primary Approver:** Mary Smithers (Sponsor), per Communication Plan, due to \$2,500 cost and schedule impact.
- **Secondary Approvers:** Cal Hamer (Product Owner, for scope alignment), Cary Manning (Project Manager, for budget/schedule).
- **Process:** Submit change request to Change Control Board (CCB, Communication Plan) by June 7, 2025, for review. Mary's approval required by June 10, 2025, to initiate licensing.

Change Request Form

Implementation Options: Consider options to implement this change. What strategies are recommended? How will implementation impact current scope, budget, and schedule milestones?

1. Option 1: Integrate Feeds in Third Sprint

- **Strategy:** Incorporate data feeds in Sprint 3 (July 31–August 29, 20XX), adding ~1–2 story points to backlog. Use CCB to prioritize feeds over non-critical reporting requirements. Allocate \$2,500 to \$5,000 data feed budget.
- **Actions:**
 - Cal Hamer updates requirements by June 7, 20XX.
 - Priya Service secures licenses by June 24, 20XX.
 - External Vendor integrates feeds (~80 hours), Keiko Tanaka tests (~20 hours).
 - Conduct stakeholder review by August 15, 20XX (Communication Plan).
- **Scope Impact:** Increases backlog to ~13.5–15.5 points, manageable in Sprint 3 (~10–12 point capacity, per prior backlogs).
- **Budget Impact:** \$2,500 fits within \$5,000 data feed budget; no labor cost increase (within Sprint 3's ~170 hours).
- **Schedule Impact:** Adds ~5–10 days to Sprint 3, within August 29, 20XX, milestone. No delay if third sprint is approved.
- **Pros:** Aligns with strategic goals (O1), leverages existing budget, minimizes schedule risk.
- **Cons:** Increases scope creep, requires third sprint approval.

2. Option 2: Fast-Track Licensing in Sprint 2 Extension

- **Strategy:** Extend Sprint 2 by 10 days (to August 9, 20XX) to start licensing early, integrating feeds in Sprint 3. Allocate \$2,500 to \$25,000 contingency budget. Limit scope to critical feed functionality.
- **Actions:**
 - Priya initiates licensing by June 7, 20XX.
 - Cal prioritizes feed requirements via CCB by June 10, 20XX.
 - External Vendor begins integration prep in Sprint 3 (~60 hours).
 - Keiko tests by August 15, 20XX.
- **Scope Impact:** Adds ~1 story point to Sprint 3, increasing backlog to ~13.5 points.
- **Budget Impact:** \$2,500 from contingency; ~\$2,400 labor for 10-day extension (~40 hours at \$60/hour).
- **Schedule Impact:** Extends Sprint 2 milestone to August 9, 20XX; Sprint 3 completes by August 29, 20XX, if approved.
- **Pros:** Accelerates integration, reduces Sprint 3 load, controls scope.
- **Cons:** Adds ~\$2,400 cost, risks licensing delays, depends on third sprint.

3. Option 3: Defer Feeds to v2

Change Request Form

- **Strategy:** Reject change for v1, deferring feeds to v2 (post-March 20XX). Focus Sprint 3 on existing backlog (~11.5 points). Use CCB to document deferral rationale.
- **Actions:**
 - CCB reviews change by June 7, 20XX, defers to v2 (Communication Plan).
 - Cal documents feed requirements for v2 backlog.
 - Priya assesses IT capacity for future integration.
- **Scope Impact:** No change to v1 scope (~11.5 points), reducing risk.
- **Budget Impact:** Saves \$2,500; no labor cost increase.
- **Schedule Impact:** Maintains Sprint 3 milestone (August 29, 20XX), assuming approval.
- **Pros:** Preserves schedule/budget, simplifies v1.
- **Cons:** Misses strategic benefits (O1), risks stakeholder dissatisfaction (Leadership, Marketing).

Decision: Accept As-Is, Accept with Modifications, Defer, Reject, Further Analysis Required

Decider(s) Name:	Date	Comments/Modifications
Mary Smithers Project Sponsor	Aug 7, 20XX	Accept as is

Decision Notes: Reasons for Decision. Decision follow-up actions necessary.

- **Reasoning:**
 - Balances strategic value with manageable impacts.
 - Prioritizes Marketing/Leadership needs, mitigates risks via CCB, testing, and reviews.
 - Rejects Option 3 (misses O1) and prefers Option 1 over Option 2 (higher cost, risk).
 - Aligns with Agile principles (iterative delivery, stakeholder feedback).
- **Follow-Up Actions:**
 - Time-bound (June 7–August 20, 20XX) to align with third sprint timeline.

Change Request Form

- Owners (Cary, Cal, Priya, Keiko, External Vendor) reflect RACI chart roles (QMP, Communication Plan).
- Deliverables support QMP (testing), Communication Plan (CCB, reviews), and Risk Register.
- Assumes third sprint approval by June 10, 20XX, and two-week licensing timeline.

Close-Out Checklist (As Applicable):

	Change Logged in Change Log (all changes, regardless of decision, must be recorded) and Posted on Project Site
	Scope Document and other Key Project Documentation Updated
	Design document, test plan, test cases, training notes, and others updated
	Schedule and budget updated
	Status Report Updated
	Change Communicated to Stakeholders