

Falstaff

Project Charter

CxSample_ProjectCharter.doc

Revision 1

July 1, 2001

Web Books

Powered By



www.construx.com

Revisions

Version	Primary Author(s)	Description of Version	Date Completed
Draft 1	Helena Flute	Initial draft of the Falstaff Project Plan	2/1/01
Draft 2	Helena Flute	Finalized draft ready for review.	3/5/01
Revision 1	Helena Flute	Review comments incorporate and document base-line	7/1/01

Review & Approval

Charter Approval History

Approving Party	Version Approved	Signature	Date
Robin Goodfellow - CEO			
William Page - VP Development			

Charter Review History

Reviewer	Version Reviewed	Signature	Date
Robin Goodfellow			
William Page			
Helena Flute – Project Manager			
Rosalind Senior – VP Marketing			

Contents

REVIEW & APPROVAL.....II

1 INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 VISION..... 1

1.2 AUTHORITIES 1

 1.2.1 Corporate Sponsor – Robin Goodfellow 1

 1.2.2 Project Sponsor - William Page 1

1.3 AGENT..... 1

1.4 ASSUMPTIONS 1

1.5 STAKEHOLDERS..... 1

 Customers..... 1

 External Projects..... 2

 Project Oversight..... 2

1.6 APPROVAL CONFIRMATION 2

2 PROJECT DEFINITION 3

2.1 GOALS..... 3

2.2 SCOPE..... 3

 2.2.1 In Scope 3

 2.2.2 Out of Scope..... 3

2.3 DRIVERS..... 3

2.4 RESOURCES 4

2.5 CONSTRAINTS 4

3 RISKS AND ASSETS 5

3.1 PROJECT RISKS 5

3.2 PROJECT ASSETS 5

4 BUSINESS CASE 6

4.1 BENEFITS..... 6

4.2 COSTS 6

1 Introduction

1.1 Vision

Enable WebBooks to become the “*one stop shopping center for all our customers entertainment needs*” by enhancing our current system to support a variety of product types.

1.2 Authorities

1.2.1 Corporate Sponsor – Robin Goodfellow

Sets corporate level goals and requirements for the product and project.

1.2.2 Project Sponsor - William Page

Oversees definition of large grain project and product requirements. Staffs the project and directly oversees the project manager. Ensures the business needs of the company are met by the project. Makes final decisions.

1.3 Agent

Helena Flute, Project Manager. Sets fine grain product and project requirements. Responsible for day to product management set.

1.4 Assumptions

The Falstaff project is based on the following assumptions.

- The new ordering systems will be available for integration testing with Falstaff by Q1 2001.
- The necessary resources (trained staff, computers, personal, etc.) will be available prior to system deployment.

1.5 Stakeholders

Involvement of the following stakeholders are critical to the success of the Falstaff project.

Customers

Falstaff is replacing the current WebBooks software. It is critical that our current customer base is happy with the new version.

The WebBooks IS department will be deploying the Falstaff project. It is critical there needs are integrated into the product.

External Projects

The Peto will be providing critical functionality to Falstaff. The involvement in planning and requirements is critical.

Project Oversight

Work on the Falstaff project will be overseen by WebBook's Software Engineering Process Group (SEGP) by the designation of a project reviewer.

1.6 Approval Confirmation

Approval for the Falstaff project was given on June 1, 2001.

2 Project Definition

Falstaff is an evolutionary delivery project which will initially replace the current system with an update architecture that supports the current functionality. The project will then iteratively add new product types (e.g. CDs, DVDs, etc.) to the system.

2.1 Goals

- The initial release of Falstaff must contain all of the currently available functionality in the WebBooks system
- Falstaff must provide a flexible and extensible architecture

2.2 Scope

2.2.1 In Scope

- Full lifecycle development project to meet project goals
- Documentation and examples to support future extension and maintenance

2.2.2 Out of Scope

- Deployment and maintenance.
- Staff training.

2.3 Drivers

The Falstaff project has the following Cost, Schedule and Performance (CSP) tradeoffs:

Project Drivers

Driver	Focus	Priority	Description
Cost	Minimize	Low	Seek to take more efficient routes and 80/20 solution on features where appropriate.
	Target	Low	There is no cost target.
Schedule	Minimize	Medium	Seek to take more efficient routes and 80/20 solution on features where appropriate.
	Target	Medium	To compete in the marketplace, new product types need to be available no later than Q2 2002
Performance	Feature	High	A flexible, extensible architecture must be created
	Quality	Medium	Normal quality levels are acceptable for Falstaff.

2.4 Resources

The development department will be committed to the Falstaff project. The Falstaff project constitutes a complete overhaul of our existing business process, so will require bandwidth from all departments during the requirements phase.

2.5 Constraints

- Falstaff must replace the current system by Q4 2001.
- Falstaff must support at least one new product type by Q1 2002.
- No more than 10 development staff can be allocated to the project
- Peto must complete the new ordering systems before complete functionality can be made available
- WebBooks must upgrade the current IS infrastructure before complete functionality can be made available

3 Risks and Assets

The following section lists the significant risks and assets for the project. The list is prioritized in decreasing order of importance. Each item has a probability and consequence of occurrence (1 being least probable and 10 being most probable).

3.1 Project Risks

Falstaff Risks

Rank	Risk Description	Probability	Impact
1	Current system architecture may not be sufficient to allow the desired expansion without a significant rewrite.	4	10
2	Time to market pressure may cause the project to short change up-front work or make decisions that will decrease the long term flexibility of the system	6	7
3	The Peto project may not be completed in time for integration testing	3	7
4	Integration with 3 rd party vendor applications may prove to be more difficult than expected, thereby delaying the system release.	2	5

3.2 Project Assets

Falstaff Assets

Rank	Asset Description	Probability	Impact
1	The existing system is well documented and of high quality. The Falstaff project can make use of much of the existing code base.	10	10
2	Senior engineers from development of the previous system are leading the Falstaff project.	10	10

4 Business Case

The Falstaff project is critical to the long term success of WebBooks in the marketplace. Without expanding our offerings beyond books, our market share will weaken and eventually the company will be unable to maintain profitability.

4.1 Benefits

We believe the Falstaff project is critical to the future of WebBooks by offering:

- An increase of 10-20% in revenue from existing clients using new offerings
- New revenue from new clients attracted to the additional product offerings
- A better position for our IPO due to a more compelling market position

4.2 Costs

Executing Falstaff will incur the following costs:

- Falstaff is expected to cost \$1.5 million in fully burdened staff hours.
- Falstaff will prevent most maintenance work on existing system