

Shared Service Initiative

High-quality, cost-effective
corporate services



Deliverable Control Sheet

Deliverable Description

Deliverable ID	Scope definition for Lattice Replacement interim solution
Project Name	CorpTech
Deliverable Name / File Name	Lattice Replacement – Interim solution scoping and planning
Deliverable Lead	Chris Prebble
Change Authority	
Purpose	Scope definition
Deliverable Composition	MS Word
Dependent Deliverables	None
Prerequisite Deliverables	None
Format	
Linked to Payment Milestone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Milestone Date:

Created: 24 December 2007	Date: 24 December 2007
Review Lead:	Date:
ACCEPTED (No further review required) <input type="checkbox"/> as is <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> with minor revision	NOT ACCEPTED (New review required) <input type="checkbox"/> major revision necessary
Approved:	Date: 28/02/08

Review Board

Review Panel	Date Reviewed
Terry Burns	22/01/08
David Ekert	22/01/08
Steve Mitchell	22/01/08
Craig Vayo	22/01/08
Andrew Atkins	22/01/08
Shaurin Shah	22/01/08

Status

Status	Date	Comment (add comment or attach document)
<input type="checkbox"/> In review		
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved "as is"		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved "minor revision"		Refer to attachment. Please include in final deliverable
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved		
<input type="checkbox"/> In discussion		
<input type="checkbox"/> ED sign-off		
<input type="checkbox"/> Checked-in		

Quality Acceptance Criteria

•
•
•
•
•
•



G:\16 - SSRO
Strategic Program Off

Defects notified to IBM regarding SOW 7 Deliverable "QHIC Scope Definition"

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
1	Changes to EBA expected in QH should be clearly identified and recognised with the approach to incorporate these changes. Emphasis should be put on using standard Workbrain rules as much as possible. Any custom rule should be agreed by QH and SDA as part of Func Spec or Tech spec of Awards before being implemented.	If the EBA detail can be provided to IBM an approach can be provided. The EBA impacts would be assessed under the agreed change control process. It would be expected that any custom rules that IBM proposes using will be identified in the impact assessment produced during the change control process and the SDA can then make a judgement as part of the review process.	Scott Euston / Chris Prebble	Yes	Agreed that the design principle for Workbrain is to use standard functionality where possible and minimise the use of Java programming. If customised functionality is required to be built the QHIC Team will notify the SDA.
2	Use of "On Demand" as Training Tool for QH is not in line with standard SSS methodology of using SAP Tutor. This will mean there are two sets of Training Documentation to be maintained at all times. SAP Tutor should be used as Training Tool.	This situation was advised to the SDA at a meeting held with Steve Mitchell on the 6 th of December at 1.30 PM. IBM can develop the training materials either way. Not using On Demand will require QH to convert all training materials to On Demand prior to being able to deliver training and SAP Tutor can not be run on QH servers (as advised by QH).	Chris Prebble	Action required by SDA	Add in Scope Definition document that the tool used for training material development may be changed through the request for change process. SDA and QH need to agree to the tool that will be used for QHIC project.
3	ESS/MSS : QH needs to decide whether they will pilot this functionality in Brisbane. IBM is contracted to do this as per the ITO offer (page 49). If not a change request needs to be raised to remove this from the scope.	As part of the scoping work, it was agreed with QH that ESS/MSS functionality could not be delivered in the timeframes available due to the significant change and training efforts required with a rollout including ESS/MSS.	Chris Prebble	Yes	Agreed that ESS/MSS can not be delivered in the QHIC Project timeframes. ESS/MSS is part of the Standard Offering and will be made available to Queensland Health at a later date.
4	Interface reusability must be clearly articulated in the scope. Before incorporating the same in SoW 8, it	Detailed in SOW 8.	Chris Prebble	Deferred	Detailed in SOW 8.

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
5	<p>must be agreed as part of the scope.</p> <p>There is a mention of SAP Query for reporting. This needs to be removed...SAP query could be very resource hungry and can potentially bring the system down. Standard extracts were developed for Department of Housing which should be used with necessary modifications and interim reporting should be based on that.</p>	Agreed.	Chris Prebble	Yes	<p>Agreed that SAP Query is only to be used if required for the interim solution.</p> <p>Action: Add to Scope Definition document that 'An agreement needs to be reached with Service Management about the number of users with access to SAP Query'.</p> <p>All users of SAP Query will be trained adequately.</p> <p>Queensland Health understands that there are risks involved in using SAP Query and that if issues arise they are responsible.</p> <p>Separate deliverable not related to scope discussion.</p>
6	Contingency Plan should be agreed before getting too far into the implementation.	This is a separate deliverable with a revised version having been submitted to vendor management for review.	Chris Prebble	Deferred to another discussion	IBM plan to reuse work previously completed by CorpTech where possible.
7	Products and Implementation methodology references should be corrected. E.g. Reference to IR 2.2 for Data Migration	Sought clarification from Shaurin - After contact have agreed to clarify at the meeting.	Chris Prebble	Yes	<p>All references to CorpTech deliverables use current CorpTech deliverable names. These may change in the future however until such time the current names will be used.</p>

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
8	Non Time and Attendance components like HD, Termination etc and its impacts on RICEFs is not mentioned in the scope.	From the available SO list (V2.8) we have included all applicable RICEFS for the in-scope processes.	Mariza Richards	Yes	Acknowledge CorpTech has highlighted this as a potential gap. As part of detailed design, if any RICEFs are identified as having been provided and were not identified as part of the "core/initial" listing (V2.8) they will be reviewed for impact to the QHIC project time frame and an RFC will be raised if required.
9	Document provides a list of partial RICEF items that are part of SO. It is not clear why it does not include all items and whether IBM wants to modify these items.	Only those RICEF items identified as "Core" and "Initial Release" were considered as clearly stated at the beginning of each section (i.e. interfaces, forms, reports, enhancements).	Mariza Richards	Yes	Agreed the correct document to use as the RICEF baseline was V2.8 of the Standard Offering. Action: Sandra Bowtell to provide differences that have identified between the Scope Definition and the RICEF list.
10	All DPDR changes should be performed using System Architect and using Visio. This should be done via RFC process.	Programme 42 will determine the methodologies and tools that will be used to deliver changes to the SO processes. For the QHIC solution only Visio will be used as access to System Architect is not available. Clarity around the RFC process (i.e. under what circumstances it is to be used) needs to be provided.	Jacqui Mazibrada	Yes	If changes to the Standard Offering are identified, an RFC will be raised. Further discussions are required with Andrew Atkins regarding the tool to be used for the interim solution. Should it be determined System Architect be the preferred tool, training will be required for QHIC team members. It should be noted that changes to the tool used for the QHIC solution could have an effect on the timeframes of

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
11	Data migration should clearly articulate how Long Service History Data would be brought forward to the new solution.	LSL data migration is listed as an open issue in the document with a workshop planned during detailed design to resolve.	Mariza Richards	Yes	the project. Action: IBM to include the SDA in planned LSL workshop.
12	PPRT should cover the full pay load. If the results achieved after first PPRT do not have many errors, subsequent PPRT runs can be with reduced employee set.	This will require a Change control. This position has been agreed with the SPO during a meeting between Malcolm Campbell, John Beeston, Keith Pullen and Chris Prebble on the 16/1/2008. The SDA/SPO to provide as detailed specification of the requirement with the request for change.	Chris Prebble	Yes	IBM Response agreed.
13	3.5.3 Reference to QHEST Support Manager needs to be corrected. Application and system Support is provided by Corptech.	The QHEST Support Manager must integrate the function with the QH Support Systems – their help desk is the starting point for support.	Chris Prebble	Yes	Action: Update the Scope Definition document to show a joint accountability between Service Desk and Queensland Health.
14	UAT Coordination is IBM's responsibility.	Yes	Chris Prebble	Yes	Action: Update Scope Definition document to show that IBM are responsible for the management of defect resolution.
15	Training of the UAT users is IBM's responsibility.	Refer to SOS 1; training delivery is a Queensland Health responsibility.	Chris Prebble	Yes	IBM will deliver "Train the Trainer" to Queensland Health. Queensland Health is responsible for delivering training to end users.
16	Section 4, point 11. Reference to Draft document should be corrected and the document should be imbedded in the scope document.	As this document was provided as part of the ITO process we believe referencing the document is sufficient.	Mariza Richards	Yes	Agreed V2.8 Draft of the Standard Offering was the correct version to use as the baseline.
17	Section 4, item 18 should be removed as an assumption. This		Mariza Richards	Yes	Action: Update Scope Definition document – assumption to remain and

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
	should be done as part of transition and validation of DoH solution.				be updated to reflect that there are additional Functional Specifications that have been developed that were not implemented as part of the Department of Housing implementation.
18	Para 3.2.1.5 - page 13. Service delivery Model. 1st assumption is that this model has been initiated and approved from within the SSP/Agency and approved by them. If this is the case, it has serious implications for the way the system is built and deployed.	This has been driven by QH. The Service Delivery Model has been approved by Queensland Health's Executive Management Team as we understand it. The QH SSP is currently working on the implementation strategy. It is expected this Model will be in place within Queensland Health in June/July 2008. This Model forms the basis of the training and change strategies being developed by the QHIC and QHEST Team.	Chris Prebble	Yes	Ron Fawcett confirmed the Service Delivery Model has been approved by Queensland Health.
19	As others have mentioned, it may also have contractual implications if IBM's response to the ITO stated that they would be including ESS/MSS in the interim solution and now they aren't.	This is QHEST and the Queensland Health SSP's decision and will not have a huge effect on the contract. The impacts of ESS/MSS would mainly be borne by Queensland Health not IBM.	Chris Prebble	Deferred	Deferred to SoW 8 discussions
20	"Training, support, change and comms ... have been reduced as a consequence of this decision". We would have thought that the change in processes, and the stated increase in manual processing that results from this decision, would	Change impact has been reduced from 68,000 to 700 (QHSSP Staff) which reduces the training and change scope significantly. There is likely to be some change for Line Managers which is being	Sara Simpson	Yes	IBM Response agreed. Acknowledge that it is to be clearly communicated that the QHIC Project represents an interim solution only and that it is not the Standard Offering.

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
	increase the change management process rather than reducing it. (refer to para 7.16.1 on page 119).	discussed and an Impact Assessment will be performed by QH to understand the change effort. It is still expected there is less change effort required than originally estimated in the ITO.			
21	Para 3.4 (page 14) is blank,	Comment added to refer to appropriate appendix.	Chris Prebble	Yes	IBM Response agreed.
22	Assumptions - page 20. No 13 says that the impending EBA changes are not included in this scope. There was a lot of discussion on this on Friday with some comments that IBM should be providing for these changes to be included.	If the EBA detail can be provided to IBM an approach can be provided. The EBA impacts would be assessed under the agreed change control process.	Mariza Richards / Chris Prebble		Addressed in Item 1.
23	IBM should use standard Workbrain configuration functionality to increase ease of modification and flexibility. Configuration using Java code should only be done with approval of the SDA.	Agreed subject to confirmation by the IBM PDO.	Chris Prebble	Yes	Addressed in Item 1.
24	Para 7.2.1.1 page 27. Exclusions include Manage Recruitment Services. RASP Lite is live in this agency. Does this mean that it remains stand-alone and that no interface or other link between RASP and SAP is needed?	Yes. Minimum scope.	Chris Prebble	Yes	IBM Response agreed.
25	Para 7.12 Data Migration page 93. The assumption regarding the data migration functions being available in time for the interim solution needs to be tested and confirmed.	Sought clarification from Shaurin - After contact it was agreed that the reference would be amended although the section identified was incorrect.	Chris Prebble	Yes	Action: Update Scope Definition document to amend the references and remove the present tense.

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
26	<p>Throughout this section (eg 7.12.2) there is reference to a CorpTech Data Migration team, which does not exist now.</p> <p>Also on 7.12.2, there is a recommendation for use of Websphere Information Server product for data extraction - is this a dependency? SSI is not responsible for procuring and hosting/provisioning, QH will pick up the costs and provisioning.</p>	<p>Yes it is a QH initiative and this is stated on page 94 which states the following.</p> <p><i>"Please note that the licensing, implementation, training of users and operation of the Websphere products is the responsibility of QHEST and is not in scope for this project."</i></p>	Chris Prebble	Yes	Action: Remove specific references to 'production' this should read 'copy of production'.
27	<p>Further on data migration- there is an emphasis on whether the data is technically "clean" for extraction and migration, there is no step to test whether the underlying data was accurate. In particular, this refers to service history, LSL etc.</p>	<p>This is a QH responsibility against the agreed accountability model.</p>	Chris Prebble	Yes	<p>Queensland Health accept that IBM can work under the assumption the QH Data Migration team will produce clean data.</p> <p>Any errors that do exist are expected to be identified during profiling.</p>
28	<p>Para 7.12.11 page 104. Assumption 5 refers to "skills sourced from the SSRO". What does this refer to?</p>	<p>The SSRO was the first organisation we dealt with on this assignment. The acronym is used many times within SOS 1 and should have been corrected if this is incorrect.</p>	Chris Prebble	Yes	Action: Update Scope Definition document to read 'resources under IBM management'.
29	<p>Para 7.14.2 at page 110. Parallel testing, including resolution of any acceptable discrepancies, need to be signed off by Audit and not just by the respective Test Managers.</p>	<p>The PPRT strategy doc will have a section showing who signs off on the final results which may or may not include agreed discrepancies and or issues that have been highlighted in Lattice legacy payroll</p>	Chris Prebble	Yes	Was understood and agreed.
30	<p>Para 7.16.3.2 provides a good</p>	<p>This is a scope document and this</p>	Chris	Yes	IBM Response agreed.

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
	summary of the positive changes, but no mention of the negative impacts. (prefer to see the balance in the table).	was provided for information purposes only. Negative impacts are described in some detail in the previous table - in the Summary of Change column. The full list of impacts will be further described in the Impact Assessment.	Prebble		
31	Section 7.3.1 refers to the attached spreadsheet for rectifications. It is not embedded in the scope document.	Has now been included as an appendix.	Chris Prebble	Yes	IBM Response agreed.
32	Section 7.8.1 refers to figure 5.7.1 which is not included.	This graphic was removed to ensure that the document was able to be delivered from an external source. These have now been provided to Shaurin Shah (14/1/2008) prior to the receipt of these comments and have been re-instated in the revised document.	Chris Prebble	Yes	IBM Response agreed.
33	Section 7.8.6, item 15 refers to "SAP XI will not be used to develop the interfaces". This should be corrected. SAP XI is the platform chosen and should be used to develop interfaces which can then be reused. Only exceptional interfaces should be done otherwise with justification and prior SDA's approval.	Lattice specific batch interfaces will NOT be developed using SAP XI unless there are compelling reasons to do so. This does not make sense. These interfaces will not be reused and issues have been identified with SAP XI as detailed in the IBM Technical validation report. Our SOS 1 details the low level of reusability that was expected in the area of interfaces.	Mariza Richards	Yes	Interfaces that are specific to the QHIC interim solution do not need to be developed in XI.
34	Section 7.11 reference to Corptech XFA team should be removed for doing the design, build, test and deployment of roles. It is IBM's	The XFA security team is still responsible for security and IBM did not contract to undertake this work.	Chris Prebble	Yes	No document change required – it was agreed this is the current arrangement and if this changes in the future an RFC can be raised.

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
	responsibility. Corptech is only Service Management & Production Support.				
35	Under section 7.12.2 Data Transformation & Mapping should be joint responsibility of IBM supported by QHEST.	It has been agreed that QHEST has responsibility for this under the accountabilities model.	Chris Prebble	Yes	Action: Add note in Scope Definition document that SSS have a responsibility in providing mapping objects/templates. IBM Response agreed.
36	Scope document should make a mention of how RASP and Saba data are going to be maintained in the interim and approach. E.g. Skills should be maintained directly in SAP.	In the Process section for Manage Employee Information an additional process has been identified for the recording of appropriate skills & qualifications to be recorded in SAP.	Mariza Richards	Yes	
37	7.12.11, point 4 needs to be clarified.		Chris Prebble	Yes	Action: Update Scope Definition document to say 'relevant issues'.
38	7.2.11 point 5 refers to SSRO resources for Data Migration. This needs to be removed.		Chris Prebble	Yes	Addressed in Item 28.
39	7.14.4 Point 3 refers to Corptech Testers. This should be removed as all testers required as per the SoW are transferred under IBM management control.	Agreed – removed. IBM will have functional management of testers seconded from Corptech but their existing HR/Line Management structure will apply	Chris Prebble	Yes	IBM Response agreed.
40	7.14.4 Point 8, IBM should provide UAT coordinator role.	Yes, duplicate point	Chris Prebble	Yes	Addressed in Item 14.
41	Under section 7.16.1, if the line managers are not have access to rostering tool which they currently have, the risk associated with this needs to be identified and mitigation steps should be documented.	This is a scope document and risks are not managed here.	Sara Simpson	Yes	IBM Response agreed. Discussed further in Item 20.
Process and Policy Services					

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
42	<p>Team</p> <p>It is very important that there is a very strong message to users of the interim solution that it is not the Standard Offering and that when the Standard Offering is implemented in 2009 that it will be different.</p>	<p>Agreed – will be managed by the Changes & Communications team, primarily through the QHEST communications structure.</p>	Sara Simpson	Yes	Addressed in Item 20.
43	<p>RICEFs - Suggest that all proposed Health specific changes, etc be reviewed for applicability to the Standard Offering. It is possible that in some cases the changes would be applicable to all agencies so the change should also be reflected in the Standard Offering.</p>	<p>This is the responsibility of Programme 42 but we would liaise with them regarding QH specific requirements.</p>	Chris Prebble	Yes	IBM Response agreed.
44	<p>Section 4 - Assumptions</p> <p>Numbering – goes 11, 13, 12, 13, 14</p>	<p>Noted – Change applied.</p>	Chris Prebble	Yes	IBM Response agreed.
45	<p>12. This is fine but if it is a process that needs to be reused when the SO offering is implemented then it should developed in alignment with SSS process and approaches (ie. stored in System Architect, etc).</p>	<p>Programme 42 will determine the tools that will be used to deliver changes to the SO processes.</p>	Chris Prebble	Yes	IBM Response agreed.
46	<p>13. (second 13). The DPDRs on the extranet are not the most up to date. There are DPDRs stored on the network that are the most up to date and are the basis for the design.</p>	<p>Initial meeting with the SME team advised that this is where base line DPDR's should be accessed. SDA were also advised that the Extranet was being used for baseline in meeting held on 4/12/2007.</p>	Jacqui Mazibrada	Yes	<p>Action: Andrew Atkins to provide QHIC team with the single point of truth for the final versions of the DPDRs.</p> <p>As part of detailed design, if any differences to DPDRs are identified they will be reviewed for impact to the QHIC project time frame and an</p>

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
47	19. After the copy is made of the DoH environment what happens when changes are made to the woG system? Are subsequent changes mirrored in the Health interim solution? The approach should be clearly described.	They will be evaluated in relation to the interim solution and if determined that they are required they will be implemented via change control. This process has been agreed with Technology services and the process has commenced.	Chris Prebble	Yes	RFC's will be raised if required. Covered under SoW6 discussions.
Section 6 – Issues					
48	3. It mentions that there are processes that could not be standardised by HRBS and consequently no DPDRs were produced. Our understanding is that this is not correct. It is not a case of the work not being able to be done but that it hasn't been done. This work should be done and DPDRs produced. As mentioned, though, responsibility for this is unclear. Further discussion on this issue is recommended with Process and Policy Services, SDA.	Agree that responsibility for this is unclear and this is why it is listed as an open issue.	Jacqui Mazibrada	Remains an open issue.	IBM Response agreed. Andrew Atkins advised that his team will help to resolve this.
49	7. Concurrent employment – Status of this is that a framework or approach (ie. business rules) for dealing with concurrent employment have been developed with the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations (DEIR). A final version of these business rules are to be decided on shortly. After this point it would be appropriate (and it	Queensland Health should evaluate / consider these rules as indicated by the open issue. Concurrent employment has not been implemented at Housing and it's inclusion would be subject to a change request.			Not discussed as it was advised that this is still being reviewed from a WoG solution perspective.

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
50	<p>is planned) to meet with Health representatives to look at the impacts for that agency.</p> <p>14. Pay in advance – When paying pay-in-advance the solution currently pays entire periods that include leave (ie. if there was leave for 2 days of the period and the remaining period included 8 working days the system would include all 10 days as part of the pay in advance). Via sector consultation Process and Policy Services recommended to HRBS the solution be changed to only pay full periods of leave (ie. pay in advance would not include any periods where there were only part days of leave – eg. not include the above example). This change has not occurred and we are currently investigating why this is not the case.</p>	Remains an open issue.	Chris Prebble	Remains an open issue.	IBM Response agreed.
Section 7 – QHIC Project Scope					
51	7.2.7 Approach – second dot point – if any of these processes are going to be required for the SO then they should be developed in line with SSS methodologies, approaches, etc.	Programme 42 will determine the methodologies and tools that will be used to deliver changes to the SO processes.	Chris Prebble	Yes	IBM Response agreed.
52	7.2.7 Approach – fourth dot point – roles mapping has not previously occurred this way – recommend that SSS roles mapping approach be	Noted.	Jacqui Mazibrada	Yes	IBM Response - agreed.

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
	reviewed prior to developing new process. Will need to get the process for assigning system roles to users.				
53	7.7.2 Leave Request Form – Are these changes that need to be made to the SO form? It may be that the standard form needs changing rather than making a specific change for Health.	This is the Rostering Solution (Workbrain) form which is not the same as the SAP ESS form.	Mariza Richards	Yes	IBM Response - agreed.
54	7.9.2 – RICEF ID 738 – Temporary Contract Extension – There is currently an RFC that has been raised by Housing requesting a notification be produced when temporary contracts are due to expire. This is currently going through the approval process.	This RICEF has been identified as a Workflow notification and as such was excluded from the forms scope.	Mariza Richards	Yes	IBM Response - agreed.
55	There is no mention of standard correspondence which is included in the RICEFs. Has this been deliberately left out? The reasoning could be that they do not need to be implemented for the interim solution.	Please explain what you mean by standard correspondence.	Mariza Richards	SDA Action	It was discussed that these RICEF items are not currently in the RICEF list shown in the Scope Definition. As discussed in Item 9 – Sandra Bowtell to provide differences that have identified between the Scope Definition and the RICEF list. If the correspondence referred to is covered under an appropriate process then it will be covered.
56	7.11 Application Security Scope – This should also mention that the Internal Controls area in Process and Policy Services, SDA will also	Please provide the details of this process and we will evaluate impact.	Chris Prebble	Yes	Item not applicable to Scope Definition discussions. Action: Include these discussions as

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
	review and test the roles for appropriate controls and segregation of duties.				part of the XFA, segregation of duties contract discussions.
57	7.14.2 In Scope Testing – RICEF Forms Testing – manual forms can be tested and this should be considered for inclusion.	IBM commits to the testing of manual forms.	John Musker	Yes	Testing of manual forms may be included in UAT testing which is QH responsibility.
58	7.16.1 Change Management Scope – Scope – Comments regarding new employee number – it should be noted that employees will be faced with another new employee number when they move onto the woG solution in 2009. Not a major issue but worth noting.	Noted	Mariza Richards	Yes	Acknowledged this may be a significant risk/issue and as has been raised in the wider programme for appropriate resolution.

Defects notified to IBM regarding SOW 7 Deliverable “QHIC Scope Definition” provided by Queensland Health

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
59	Item Raised by Ron Fawcett in meeting 17/1/08 – Parallel Payroll Run Testing. QH are in the process of ratifying the Payroll testing approach with the Business Reference Group (BRG). In the meantime we request that the SDA include within scope of the QHIC Project, the full Testing Strategy recommended for woG systems.	If, as a result of BRG discussions, changes are required to the proposed approach, an RFC will be raised to change the strategy. At that time an impact assessment will be performed to understand the implications of the change on the project.	John Musker	Yes	IBM Response agreed.
60	Item Raised by Ron Fawcett in meeting 17/1/08 – Rostering Templates. QH is planning to initially deploy Rostering	During the scoping workshops conducted with QH it was agreed that ESS/MSS functionality would		Yes	ESS/MSS functionality will not be available to QH as part of the QHIC solution. Should QH require this

Item #	Defect	IBM Response	IBM responder	Resolved	Outcomes & Actions
	<p>functionality through a Hub-and-Spoke service model designed to contain the impact of system change to the Shared Services Provided (SSP) as much as possible. However the intention is to take advantage of the ESS/MSS where and when possible so we ask the provision of these services to remain in scope for the QHIC project.</p>	<p>not be developed as it would add significant risk to the projects agreed timelines. The Scope Definition document was developed based on this agreement.</p> <p>If ESS/MSS functionality is a requirement a new Scope Definition document will be required to be developed and the current project timeframes will not be able to be met.</p>			<p>functionally at a later date they can request it and work will be done then to assess the time and cost involved in implementing it.</p> <p>Queensland Health will receive ESS/MSS functionality as part of the full Standard Offering rollout in 2009.</p>