

Change Order Form

Originator Name:	Ron Harris	Change Order #:	CS5
Organization:	CalSAWS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Submission Date:	11/20/2020

Description of Change Requested			
New Requirement <input type="checkbox"/>	Requirement Update <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Requirement Removal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Design Change <input type="checkbox"/>	Implementation Change <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>The contents of this no-cost Change Order identify updates to various requirements previously identified in the OCAT Scope of Requirements (SOR) and Statement of Work (SOW) documents.</p>			
<p>Justification for Change: <i>(Include reasons for the change & consequences if the change is rejected or denied)</i></p>			
<p>The Cambria team met with members of CalSAWS Consortium and Quality Assurance teams to validate Requirements and approve the OCAT deliverables . Through this process of collaborative review and approval, the teams identified several requirements from the original SOR and SOW that must be updated in order to align with the acceptance of OCAT deliverables.</p> <p>The recommended updates and obsolescence of requirements in this document have been reviewed and agreed upon with the following Consortium and QA members, including:</p> <p>Jo Anne Osborn Laura Chavez Greg Fitzgerald Dan Dean</p>			
<p>Identify Impacted Areas: <i>(Cost, Schedule, and Scope – Increases or Decrease)</i></p>			
One-time Cost Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Project Cost Decreased <input type="checkbox"/>	Scope Decrease <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>
Ongoing Cost Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Schedule Change <input type="checkbox"/>	Scope Increase <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Describe Impact:</p>			

The requirement changes in this no-cost Change Order will have no impact to the scope or schedule of the OCAT project.			
Solution Description & Impact on Baselined Items:			
The design impact resulting from these requirement changes are included in the approved OCAT deliverables.			
Priority:			
Urgent <input type="checkbox"/>	High <input type="checkbox"/>	Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Low <input type="checkbox"/>

Risks	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Describe the Risk	
The recommended requirement updates simply clean up and align the requirements language with the agreed upon solution design and final deliverable acceptance. There is no anticipated risk to accepting these changes.	

1 Change Control Board Approval

Change Control Board			
No CCB Review needed for this CR			
Decision Disposition:	Approved <input type="checkbox"/>	Denied <input type="checkbox"/>	Deferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Decision Justification:			
Board Member Signatures			
Print	Sign	Date	

2 Updated Requirements

The requirements outlined in this section are recommended for update.

Req ID	Requirement	Recommended Requirement Language Update	Rationale
SOW Phase 1 Deliverable #6 – Technical Design Document	<p>The Contractor shall provide the Technical Design Document. The Technical Design Document shall provide comprehensive architectural overview of the OCAT Software, including a depiction of each layer and area of application in terms of Software components. The Technical Design Document shall describe the significant architectural decisions made on the OCAT Software. The Technical Design Document shall also describe how the Contractor will establish at the applicable locations, configure, implement, test, operate and maintain for CONSORTIUM such Equipment, Software, Network, and other components that will be used for the AWS Government Cloud.</p> <p>Contractor shall submit the project Technical Design Document, which will document and address the following in Exhibit B – Statement of Requirements as specified in the RTM;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Technical Architecture specifications; 2. System components and entity relationship diagrams; 3. Network topology diagrams, including Cloud computing environment; 	<p>The Contractor shall provide the Technical Design Document. The Technical Design Document shall provide comprehensive architectural overview of the OCAT Software, including a depiction of each layer and area of application in terms of Software components. The Technical Design Document shall describe the significant architectural decisions made on the OCAT Software. The Technical Design Document shall also describe how the Contractor will establish at the applicable locations, configure, implement, test, operate and maintain for CONSORTIUM such Equipment, Software, Network, and other components that will be used for the AWS Public Cloud.</p> <p>Contractor shall submit the project Technical Design Document, which will document and address the following in Exhibit B – Statement of Requirements as specified in the RTM;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Technical Architecture specifications; 2. System components and entity relationship diagrams; 3. Network topology diagrams, including Cloud computing environment; 	<p>This language in the SoW will be updated in coordination with the Consortium and QA. This plan of action was made in a joint meeting with the OCAT Team, CISO, and QA.</p> <p>This requirement explicitly references the AWS Government Cloud, but OCAT, per direction of the Consortium, is hosted on the AWS Public Cloud. This requirement should be updated to reference the AWS Public Cloud as opposed to the AWS Government Cloud.</p> <p>#8 – Physical and logical directory path locations does not apply to our modern cloud architecture. Code deployment, S3 buckets, and other system functions are described in the TDD. Per agreement from Consortium in the 3/12/2020 TDD requirements meeting, language in the SOW will be updated to remove or obsolete Item 8 in the SOW description.</p> <p>#9 – Format library specification and update tools come from the mainframe technology space. Since OCAT is cloud native, these technology elements do not apply and should be removed.</p>

Req ID	Requirement	Recommended Requirement Language Update	Rationale
	4. Information Security design (application and network security protocols); 5. Application architecture design (software layers); 6. Webservice/application programming interface (API) design; 7. Physical Data Model; 8. Physical and logical directory path locations; and 9. Format library specification, and update tools.	4. Information Security design (application and network security protocols); 5. Application architecture design (software layers); 6. Webservice/application programming interface (API) design; 7. Physical Data Model.	
6.7	The reduction in service payment will be equivalent to the percentage of time the system was unavailable for the month in which the unavailability occurred (e.g., two hundred twenty (220) hours of available time in one (1) month, with a two (2) hour system unavailability period, would result in a one percent (1%) reduction in the payment for hosting for the month in which the unavailability occurred.) An exception to this will be unavailability due to maintenance, so long as the interruptions occur between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Pacific Standard Time.	The reduction in service payment will be equivalent to the percentage of time the system was unavailable for the month in which the unavailability occurred (e.g., two hundred twenty (220) hours of available time in one (1) month, with a two (2) hour system unavailability period, would result in a 0.91% reduction in the payment for hosting for the month in which the unavailability occurred.) An exception to this will be unavailability due to maintenance approved by the Consortium.	1. The SLA reads, in part: "The reduction in service payment will be equivalent to the percentage of time the system was unavailable" but the SLA's example uses hours, and rounds up, to penalize more than the percentage of time the system was unavailable. The example is unavailable for 2 / 220 hours (0.91% unavailability time) but penalizes at 1% penalty. Adjusting the example to provide an accurate calculation. 2. The maintenance time of 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. is not aligned with the system availability times of 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Per discussions with the Consortium, recommend removing the specific times and changing the requirement to be based on Consortium approval.
4.2	OCAT application shall enforce role-based security protocols with page-level and field-level security rights to view, enter or change data based on	OCAT application shall enforce role-based security protocols with page-level security rights to view, enter or change data based on respective domain of	In a TDD requirements meeting, the Consortium confirmed the OCAT design and agreed that this requirement should go through a change request to

Req ID	Requirement	Recommended Requirement Language Update	Rationale
	respective domain of control and authority of the user, which considers agency, county, office, business unit, scope of role, responsibilities, and other parameters as defined by the Consortium or proposed by the Contractor.	control and authority of the user, which considers agency, county, office, business unit, scope of role, responsibilities, and other parameters as defined by the Consortium or proposed by the Contractor.	update the wording to align with the actual OCAT design and implementation, which does not require field-level security.
SOW Phase 2 Deliverable #4 – OCAT Transition Plan	Contractor shall provide an initial draft of the OCAT Transition Plan within thirty (30) days of completing Deliverable 13 – Performance Verification Report and Final Acceptance. Contractor shall maintain and update the Transition Plan annually for CONSORTIUM Executive Director's approval and be able to provide an updated copy within thirty (30) days of CONSORTIUM request. Contractor shall keep the most current version of the OCAT repository throughout the term of the Agreement.	Contractor shall provide an initial draft of the OCAT Transition Plan. Contractor shall maintain and update the Transition Plan annually for CONSORTIUM Executive Director's approval and be able to provide an updated copy within thirty (30) days of CONSORTIUM request. Contractor shall keep the most current version of the OCAT repository throughout the term of the Agreement.	Per agreement with the Consortium, the timeline for Deliverable 13 has been extended to occur after the BRE Implementation. As a result, the timing of the initial draft of this Phase 2 Deliverable 4 will no longer occur after Deliverable 13. This change modifies the language accordingly.

3 Obsolete Requirements

Due to design impact and simplification of the OCAT workflow, the following requirements are recommended for removal from the RTM deliverable.

Req ID	Requirement	Rationale
4.15	OCAT users shall be able to reset their own passwords using industry standard two-step verification process.	This requirement was confirmed with the Consortium to be transferred to the Consortium as part of the ForgeRock implementation.
5.8	OCAT shall allow the user to change their own password and other user account information through the global navigation toolbar.	This requirement was confirmed with the Consortium to be transferred to the Consortium as part of the ForgeRock implementation.

4 New Requirements

The following requirements in this section have been identified as new requirements for the RTM deliverable. These new requirements will not have an impact on schedule or scope and resulting designs have been included and approved as part of the General Design Document 05 deliverable.

Req ID	Requirement Language	Rationale

5 Approval

CalSAWS Approval			
Decision Disposition:	Approved <input type="checkbox"/>	Denied <input type="checkbox"/>	Deferred <input type="checkbox"/>
Decision Justification:			
<i>Print</i>	<i>Sign</i>	<i>Date</i>	
Cambria Approval			
<i>Print</i>	<i>Sign</i>	<i>Date</i>	