**PROGRAMME REQUEST FOR CHANGE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Change Control Register Reference (to be inserted by Programme Manager or deputy): | TBD |

|  |
| --- |
| Boxes shaded in BLUE highlight decision points in the process |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **CHANGE REQUEST DETAILS**   This section to be completed by either the Project Business Leads or Programme Leads, depending on the source of the change. PMO Project Managers to complete when raising a request for a non Project change. See Note 1 at end. | | | | | |
| Change Category (tick ü as appropriate)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Non Project |  |  | Estimates |  |  | Risk | X | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | BAU Change |  |  | Schedule | X |  | Dependencies |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Business Requirement | X |  | Budget |  |  | Issues | X | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Business Process | X |  | Resourcing | x |  | Design | X | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Product |  |  | Constraints |  |  | Defect Triage |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Technology | X |  | Assumptions |  |  | Other - Documents |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | |
| Change Requestor | Amit Chopra | | | | |
| Change Request Date | 24-AUG-2022 | | | | |
| Change Priority (High / Medium / Low) | Med | | | | |
| Description of Change Request  Additional effort and time (development, testing, etc.) is required on the below additional/new Citco requirements.  1. Purchase Order Distribution Charge / Expense Account – CoA Segment 4 (Location)  • There was a new requirement from Citco to derive the PO Charge / Expense Account Segment4 (Location) from the Bill To Location value at the PO Header level rather than use the GL Segment 4 (Location) mapping for this scenario.  • Later on, the above requirement was changed by Citco, to derive the PO Charge / Expense Account Segment4 (Location) from the PO Business Unit rather than from the Bill To Location value. This was needed because of cross country transactions. This will need re-work to accommodate this request within Maximise.  • Please see attached excel document for the mapping.    2. Fixed Assets Depreciation Expense Account – CoA Segment 4 (Location)  • There was a new requirement from Citco to derive the FA Depreciation Expense Account Segment4 (Location) based on the ‘physical location’ of the asset which is tagged to each asset, rather than use the GL Segment 4 (Location) mapping for this scenario. Details are given below:  For US Companies 1530 & 2190:  • If Company is either 1530 or 2190 (US companies) and if the asset physical location\_segment1 (country) = US, THEN use City segment value from physical asset location to derive the CoA Location segment4 (Please see below table):   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Asset LOCATION\_SEGMENT4 (City)** | **CoA Location Segment4** | | Atlanta | US10 | | Charlotte | US01 | | Columbus | US03 | | Doral | US03 | | Dover | US02 | | Fort Lauderdale | US03 | | Jersey City | US04 | | Malvern | US05 | | Miami | US06 | | New York | US07 | | Rye Brook | US03 | | San Francisco | US08 | | Wilmington; New Castle | US09 |   • However, if Company is either 1530 or 2190 (US companies) BUT the physical location\_segment1 (country) is not equal to US, THEN use default value of US03.  2. For CA (Canada) Companies 1480 or 2110:  • If Company is either 1480 or 2110 (CA companies) and if the physical location\_segment1 (country) = CA, THEN use City segment value from physical asset location to derive the CoA Location segment4 (Please see below table):   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Asset LOCATION\_SEGMENT4 (City)** | **CoA Location Segment4** | | Halifax | CA01 | | Toronto | CA02 |   • However, if Company is either 1480 or 2110 (CA companies) BUT the physical location\_segment1 (country) is not equal to CA, THEN use default value of CA02.  3. For IE (Ireland) Companies 1520 or 2690:  • If Company is either 1520 or 2690 (IE companies) and if the physical location\_segment1 (country) = IE, THEN use City segment value from physical asset location to derive the CoA Location segment4 (Please see below table):   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Asset LOCATION\_SEGMENT4 (City)** | **CoA Location Segment4** | | Cork | IE01 | | Dublin | IE02 |   • However, if Company is either 1520 or 2690 (IE companies) BUT the physical location\_segment1 (country) is not equal to IE, THEN use default value of IE02. | | | Impact of Not Implementing Change  Impacts:  Assumption: | | |
| Approval of Programme Lead for RFC to enter Change Control Process | | | Pending Design Authority | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **3. EFFORT ESTIMATE TO COMPLETE IMPACT ASSESSMENT (Days)**  Completion of this section to be coordinated by the Business Requirements Lead, or other Programme Leads if the RFC is not a business requirement | | | | | |
| Development Effort | | 0 | | | |
| Total Effort | | 0 | | | |
| Allow IA to Proceed - Approve or Reject | |  | | | |
| Decision date | |  | | | |
| Authority for decision (see Note 2) | |  | | | |
| Reason if Rejected | |  | | | |
| **4. IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF CHANGE REQUEST**  Completion of this section to be coordinated by the Business Requirements Lead, or other Programme Leads if the RFC is not a business requirement | | | | | |
| **Workstream** | | **Implementation Effort Estimate (days or portion thereof)** | | | |
| Requirements gathering & documentation | |  | | | |
| Functional specification | |  | | | |
| Design effort (high level & low level) | |  | | | |
| Development & unit test | |  | | | |
| Test | |  | | | |
| Training | |  | | | |
| Migration (into all Environments) | |  | | | |
| Integration | |  | | | |
| Other | |  | | | |
| **Total Effort Estimate** | | **0** | | | |
|  | |  | | | |
| Total Incremental Cost Impact | |  | | | |
| Total Cost of Ownership Details | |  | | | |
| Risk Impacts | |  | | | |
| Quality Impacts | |  | | | |
| Resourcing Impacts | |  | | | |
| Schedule Impacts | |  | | | |
| Other Impacts | |  | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **5. PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT**  This section to be completed by the Business Requirements Lead in conjunction with the Business Lead, or other Programme Leads if RFC is not a business requirement. | | | | | |
|  | | | | | **Yes or No** |
| Do benefits outweigh impacts sufficiently to justify further consideration ? | | | | |  |
| Is there an acceptable workaround ? | | | | |  |
| Could the requirement be switched with another requirement of similar size which could be dropped ?. If so, provide details. | | | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
| **6. RFC FINAL DECISION DETAILS**  This section to be completed by the party making the final decision. | | | | | |
| RFC Decision – Approve or Reject RFC | |  | | | |
| Decision Date | |  | | | |
| Authority for Decision (see Note 3) | |  | | | |
| Reason(s) for decision | |  | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| **7. CHANGE CONTROL PROCESS CLOSE OUT**  This section to be completed by the Business Requirements Lead or other Programme Leads if RFC is not a business requirement. | | | | | |
|  | | | | **Indicate Yes** | |
| Confirmation that the Change Control Register has been updated with final outcome of Change Control Process ? | | | |  | |
| If the RFC is a new or change to an existing Business Requirement which has been approved, confirmation that Quality Centre been updated ? | | | |  | |
| Confirmation that the final outcome of Change Control Process been communicated to Change Requestor ? | | | |  | |

**Note 1 - Approval Limits to Allow Impact Assessment to Proceed**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Who** | **Authority Limits** |
| Programme Leads | 0.5 hours development effort, 2 hours in total |
| Programme Manager | 2 hours development effort, 8 hours in total |
| Chair of Steering Group | 1 day dev effort, 4 days in total  Note  It is assumed that the estimate of effort to carry out a full impact assessment of a change request would never exceed this authority limit. This assumption is being made to avoid overly complicating the process flow diagram. In the unlikely event of an effort estimate to carry out a full impact assessment being greater than this limit, then it is assumed that the Steering Chair would simply escalate the matter to the full Steering Group. |

**Note 2 – Change Approval Limits**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Who** | **Authority Limits** |
| Programme Manager | * 1 day effort in total * €1000 total incremental unbudgeted cost |
| Change Approval Board | * 8 days effort in total * €5000 total incremental unbudgeted cost * Authorised to vary the sequencing of project schedules provided any such change does not impact on a baselined milestone date(s) |
| Steering Group | * 40 days effort in total * 50,000 total incremental unbudgeted cost * Authorised to vary project schedules including baselined milestone date(s) provided any such change does not impact the overall Programme end delivery date |