CG1

CONFIG DOC PRETTY EVEN SPLIT — VENDOR MORE THAN STATE AK KNOWLEDGE

PROJECT WORK PLAN

1. METHODOLOGY FOR MANAGING PROJECT SCOPE, SCHEDULE, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT: We know that the State of Alaska (the State), while similar in many dimensions to other states, has a unique combination of systems, business processes, requirements, culture, and geography. We have a unique understanding of these specific elements and proven expertise in managing, implementing, transitioning, training, and maintaining ERP solutions specifically for governments. We will use our ERP COTS Implementation Methodology (E-CIM) to manage this project. E-CIM combines industry best practices for project management (e.g., PMBOK, IEEE, CMMI, ISO) with a structured, four-phase implementation model derived from breakthrough performance concepts. The four phases are Envision, Create, Achieve, and Support. E-CIM spans the full project lifecycle, and includes processes, templates, and tools for managing scope, schedule, budget, and daily implementation activities. We will tailor E-CIM specifically for the State using knowledge gained from our past projects with multiple, major Alaska departments. This section provides a high-level summary of our approach.

Managing Scope – Developing a perfect project plan at the outset, and expecting that plan to remain static is unrealistic for a project with this level of complexity. Changes will arise that must be accommodated and addressed for a successful outcome. Consistent requirements traceability is critical, and a foundation of our E-CIM methodology. During the E-CIM Envision phase, we will collaborate with the State to confirm requirements, and use our collective knowledge of the state legacy systems and processes to produce a clear project plan and solution blueprint. This blueprint provides a comprehensive picture of the entire ERP solution (including baseline requirements, interfaces, data sources, configuration decisions, and hardware infrastructure) very early in the project. Developing this comprehensive picture early is the only way to effectively manage the project, and minimize the implications of scope changes that often materialize months later. E-CIM is highly flexible and built to accommodate new, time-sensitive requirements often introduced by external forces ([redacted]). We address these inevitable changes in a disciplined, methodical fashion. During the pre-award phase, we will clearly document our mutual understanding of scope. During the post-award implementation phase, our scope management processes will be used to analyze, document, and implement any agreed changes.

Managing Schedule – We will manage and control the comprehensive work plan, including State activities and ours. The project Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and schedule will be refined and validated during the pre-award phase, and will be the vehicle for our schedule management activities. The work plan defines schedule, responsibility, and accountability at the individual team member level, and is sufficiently granular to manage tasks and resources without being cumbersome to create and maintain. The work plan encompasses all aspects of the project, and breaks the work into discrete phases, groupings, and tasks. Day-to-day project activities and dependencies between and within the phases will be clearly identified. We will baseline the schedule at the end of pre-award, and start tracking actual versus estimated effort. We report progress at the individual task level with team leads, group leads, and senior project management verifying the results. The work plan will be visible to all staff, and a dashboard will be provided to senior management and the project steering committee for project visibility.

Managing Implementation - The State needs a vendor that emphasizes project management, organizes tasks based on proven experience, assigns work to the right staff, manages the work activities, and provides adequate visibility and reporting to the State's Project Steering Committee. Our governance structure will define roles and responsibilities, decision rights, performance measures, and escalation procedures consistent with Attachment L (L-3). Our iterative, waterfall approach has regular checkpoints to assess quality, and address issues and risks. Our management team will remove obstacles, and confirm that team members have access to the resources, information, and material needed to complete their work. Project management will also coordinate with external project stakeholders, monitor progress and quality, report status to the Steering Committee, and facilitate issue resolution. Members will perform work in accordance with the schedule and identify issues and risks as appropriate. Group and team leads will monitor performance, conduct quality reviews, and verify completed tasks. Our Go/No-Go readiness assessment determines when to proceed with cutover activities.

2. APPROACH FOR MANAGING ERP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES. History has clearly shown that it takes more than the right ERP product to succeed. The State also needs the right team and the right approach. We will bring experienced senior staff to the State that has led successful statewide ERP projects. One of our key differentiators is that we bring both deep implementation and specific knowledge

TM

of Alaska's business and legacy systems. This unique blend of expertise reduces risk.

System Initialization - This activity coincides with the E-CIM Envision phase and includes confirming requirements, identifying optimal configuration to enable business processes, assigning individual project tasks, coordinating activities, and monitoring and reporting quality and progress. During System Initialization, we will confirm the technical infrastructure and business process strategy, conduct benchmarking, define cost effective solutions for performance and scalability, and recommend the right hardware infrastructure and configuration required to implement and support the new ERP. The agreed upon technical infrastructure will also be prepared during initialization.

System Installation - The activities of analyzing the requirements for rack space, power, air conditioning, connectivity, operating system configuration, and integrating with the State's Tivoli backup system will be coordinated with the project team and the State's ETS division. System installation encompasses the hardware and software environments needed to support BPR, configuration, testing, training, conversion, and production activities across all phases. A comprehensive installation test is performed on all environments prior to release to the project team and the Installation Certification Document is prepared and submitted.

Business Process Design/Reengineering - This full lifecycle activity uses interactive BPR sessions to map current as-is processes to government best practices and our solution capabilities. System configuration options and as-is business processes will be reviewed with stakeholders in each functional area to identify improvement opportunities, and reduce customizations. We will work with the State to meet business requirements using the baseline product and configuration, rather than new code. Our BPR approach includes two key tenets: 1) include all business processes when creating the solution blueprint and planning the deployment; and 2) use our Alaska and public sector experience to assess the impact of potential process changes on policies, statutes, process integrity, and information access.

System Configuration - System configuration activities are performed throughout the project and include configuration training, selecting and implementing configuration options, and delivering comprehensive configuration documentation. System settings and configuration options necessary for each business area (referenced in Sample Configuration Plan) are also included. A baseline configuration environment will be established and maintained with current system configuration settings. This environment will be updated and maintained by authorized staff throughout the project and will serve as the "gold standard" for updating other environments as needed.

System Tailoring – We will use a four-pronged approach to tailor our solution: 1) provide an out-of-the-box COTS solution meeting at least 88% of the State's requirements based on our preliminary assessment, 2) provide a comprehensive set of configuration capabilities to implement existing processes and facilitate future upgrades, 3) leverage BPR to realign state business processes with government best practices embedded within our ERP, and 4) wherever possible, incorporate the State's software customizations into our baseline COTS product to reduce the cost of maintenance and future upgrades. During pre-award, we will work with the State's SMEs to understand the intent for requirements marked as "not met" in Exhibit F. As with our other implementations, we are confident that with this interaction, along with our proposed value added services, we can achieve a 100% fit.

Interface Design and Development – During pre-award, we will confirm our understanding of the existing interfaces, data they exchange, and their operating patterns. We will develop a set of interface specifications based on our past experience with the AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA, and other legacy systems. We will produce an interface map detailing how and when each interface is transitioned to the ERP, which interfaces are retired, the number of interfaces to be created, and any temporary interfaces to be used during the phased implementation (e.g. AKPAY to ERP for personal services information). We will use our standard data integration tool to develop the system interfaces based on the approved interface specifications. We will test and validate the operation of the interfaces against the ERP, and 3rd party interfaces which can be problematic, and coordinate the transition of the interfaces from legacy systems to the new ERP.

Data Conversion – We have extensive experience with the data models and structures of the AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA and supporting legacy systems. We will develop a Conversion Plan that maps the data between the legacy data sources and the new ERP. These maps define transformation (including data typing) and validation rules to be applied during the conversion process. Sample conversion runs are performed to verify the process and rules, and identify data quality issues. The conversion process will target current and prior year information from AKSAS, and current information from AKPAY and WPA.

TM

Historical data will remain in ALDER. Once in production, the ERP will feed data to ALDER.

Testing - We will develop a comprehensive Test Plan outlining the approach, testing activities, data requirements, and test reporting activities. We will leverage a repository of existing public sector and scenario-based scripts, and develop new scripts, all traced back to baseline requirements. Scripts will cover system, integration, performance, and acceptance testing. We will use production-level data to validate the business functionality and system performance capabilities of the technical environment. Our testing tools will provide visibility related to progress and results. We will work with the State to define a clear set of Go/No Go criteria for system acceptance.

Post-implementation Stabilization - This activity starts with developing the Go Live and Stabilization Plan. This plan includes mutually agreed upon criteria for moving into production, a readiness checklist, and tasks and resource assignments for Go Live. The Go Live Plan also includes a data load plan for conversion. A rollback contingency plan will be developed in the unlikely event that significant problems occur following cutover. In addition to the configured and tested software solution, we will provide in-depth functional and technical training and knowledge transfer, comprehensive training materials, ERP documentation, and transition support to the ETS team. Our transition team will provide initial maintenance and stabilization services as each phase is implemented, and will remain on-site until each phase is complete.

3. TRANSITION FROM EXISTING TO PROPOSED SYSTEMS. We will execute system transition tasks within each project phase and across the entire project lifecycle based on a comprehensive Transition Plan coordinated with the State's business and technical staff. A key differentiator of our approach is "just-in-time" software licensing and installation. Licenses for operating systems, databases, and ERP modules are obtained and used as needed, and no earlier, resulting in significant acquisition and maintenance cost savings. The Transition Plan describes steps required to transition from legacy systems to the new ERP, including software, infrastructure, data, staff readiness, and staff functional and technical training. The team will conduct mock conversions to verify readiness, and confirm data quality. Our plan is based on realistic implementation dates, including fiscal year end, annual close, and other key dates. After Go Live, we will transition solution maintenance and support to the State's Help Desk.

4. EDUCATE AND TRAIN STATE EMPLOYEES ON THE PROPOSED SYSTEMS. We use a holistic approach to education and training, knowledge transfer, and skill development by addressing the needs of end users, systems and technical staff, senior management, and other stakeholders. We will develop a comprehensive Training Plan defining the training curriculum, training materials, delivery methods, instructors and attendees, schedule, and tools. Our approach will incorporate the State's unique geographic challenges, staff and facility availability, and scheduling constraints. Education and training for key functional and technical staff will begin in the pre-award phase and continue throughout the project, expanding to end user groups prior to Go Live. We will use a train-the-trainer approach with a combination of formal classroom training in Juneau and other state training facilities, distance learning, and computer-based training. We will also provide a complete set of functional and technical training materials and Quick Reference Guides tailored to the State of Alaska implementation.

5. MONITOR PERFORMANCE THROUGHOUT THE CONTRACT TERM. A key to managing large complex projects is selecting the right attributes to measure and monitor. Those activities controlling critical path, or containing significant risk or complex dependencies, must be monitored and measured. Performance measures will be focused on the actual product and solution, not the work by-products created during the project. Installing the solution, completing configuration, and completing data conversion are examples of key project milestones against which performance can readily be measured. Our E-CIM methodology leverages PMBOK-based principles and includes proactive processes, reusable templates, and dashboard tools to monitor performance, and provide exception-based reporting and visibility to internal and external stakeholders. We will establish mutually agreed upon key performance indicators with the State at the on-set. We will also conduct project health reporting using specific methods, tools, and quantifiable measures (e.g., cost and schedule variance reporting) to clearly indicate status, and manage change, risks, and issues. Project status will always be visible to the State, and monitored by our corporate Project Management Office through a mandatory monthly client engagement health check process. A Weekly Risk Report (WRR) will be prepared and if any project health issues arise, corrective actions will be implemented. Corrective measures may include additional reporting and monitoring, and/or additional executive oversight of the engagement. This process has produced a perfect ERP implementation track record – truly the lowest risk delivery method.

TM

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk 1: Critical – The product selected as the foundation is not specifically suited for use in the public sector. This leads to compromising functional requirements and excessive customizations diluting the value of the ERP and leading to increased risk for schedule slippage and cost overruns. In a Southern California school district, after a delayed rollout and cost overruns, the district concluded, "It can't be fixed. They need to change the system, dump... and come up with a system that deals with [public sector] payroll only."
Mitigation: Right product. Implement a solution that has been successfully implemented in over 190 states, state departments, municipalities, and other government organizations. Our product's native alignment to Alaska's requirements results in an 88% out-of-the-box fit. With our proposed value added services and BPR, we can achieve a 100% fit.

Risk 2: Critical – The vendor team lacks implementation knowledge and specifics on Alaska systems. Inexperienced staff underestimates complexities, and fails to understand the scope and breadth of critical system interfaces, resulting in poor project scheduling, resourcing and staffing estimates. In August 2010, a California Bay Area county was forced to "rip and replace" its ailing ERP system which after four years of implementation met only 50% of the functionality required. The county complaint stated the vendor used the project as a "trial and error" training ground for inexperienced staff.
Mitigation: Right Team. Our project team only implements our ERP product; each of our key project team members has successfully implemented our product in multiple states. Collectively, our team brings over 75+ years of field experience successfully implementing our product. Specifically, our project manager has implemented our product in 6 states. Our business/functional lead has also implemented our product in multiple states. Our DW/Reporting lead has extensive experience with other State of Alaska Departments the specific systems (AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA) that the new ERP is replacing, and Alaska's data warehouse and reporting solution (ALDER). Our project team, senior management, and system staff (which build and maintain our ERP product) bring Alaska a highly seasoned, proven team with a deep understanding of public sector ERP systems and direct Alaska experience.

Risk 3: Critical – Vendors without a standard methodology adapted specifically to the unique needs of Alaska will be unable to create and execute a realistic and achievable plan. The multi-phased implementation of an ERP is a complex undertaking requiring a comprehensive, proven approach to completing the project. This risk will result in key activities being omitted, an underestimate of the level of effort, and unrealistic time commitments for key State staff. The lack of a standard methodology tailored specifically to the needs of the State of Alaska will jeopardize project value, increase costs, and introduce unnecessary risk.
Mitigation: Right Methodology/Approach. Our estimates are based on factual historical metrics collected from over 190 implementations of our product in the state and local government space. For Alaska, we have crafted a comprehensive approach based on our in-depth understanding of the State's business environment, staff, and legacy systems. We validated our Alaska plan for completeness and accuracy against these historical metrics. We recognize that the implementation process is not a sprint and must make efficient use of resources over a period of years not weeks. Knowing state resources must continue supporting the business; legacy systems, and other time sensitive requests (e.g., implementing fund categories to meet GASB reporting requirements), our approach targets participation of state resources in a focused and balanced manner. This is the right approach to reduce the risk of schedule delays caused by unrealistic or uninformed expectations of state resource time and participation levels.

Risk 4: Critical – Attempting to integrate an ERP's standard reporting tool alongside or in place of ALDER increases implementation risk, reduces user efficiency, limits enterprise data access, increases maintenance and operations costs, and potentially jeopardize business continuity. As stated in the RFP, the new solution must be integrated with ALDER to support historical and current transactional reporting. ALDER is a complex and powerful reporting tool and integration is complex.
Mitigation: Right use of ALDER by integrating to the ERP solution. Instead of relegating ALDER to a historical only repository or replacing it, our solution is to utilize ALDER as **the** reporting tool for ERP. This fully leverages Alaska's investment and takes advantage of ALDER's widespread adoption. Data

TM

from our ERP solution will be loaded into the ALDER database and historical and current financial transaction reporting is done through ALDER's Business Objects front end. This will provide a statewide view of financial, procurement, and human resources data. As a result, Alaska staff will require minimal training on the new reports, and have broader access to strategic ERP data. Our approach to ALDER as the reporting solution reduces license, maintenance and operating costs, while also reducing implementation risk and increasing user satisfaction and adoption of the new ERP system.

Risk 5: Severe – Not staffing for a multi-year project the size and complexity of Alaska ERP (which is more critical than for small, short duration, narrowly focused projects). Large, complex ERP projects require staff committed to the entire project lifecycle to avoid the risks associated with staff turnover – particularly of key senior staff. This turnover impacts timely and efficient decision making, compromises team collaboration, and impacts project schedule.
Mitigation: Right Staff Plan. We understand firsthand the unique challenges and costs of staffing a long-term project in Alaska with SMEs from other parts of the U.S. Climate, culture, and distance combine to create a unique set of project challenges in Alaska. We are committing one of our most seasoned, experienced, and dedicated project managers who has started and successfully finished all six of the previous ERP projects she has managed. Additionally our project manager will relocate to Juneau for the duration of the project to maximize time on-site, and to support effective collaboration with Alaska. Our functional/technical SMEs will work onsite for efficient collaboration and direct interaction with state staff. When appropriate, they will work remotely to minimize travel costs. We have successfully applied this same distributed project team structure on other complex Alaska projects. Additionally, we have added a top ranked local Alaska IT partner with state systems experience and resources on the ground in Juneau to augment our data conversion activities and local on-site presence.

Risk 6: Severe – The tight linkage between AKSAS and AKPAY raises the risk of failure when an existing linkage is replaced in Phase 1 with the new ERP financial module. As described in the 2006 Business Case, a natural disaster (or system failure) impacting AKSAS or AKPAY during the implementation of the ERP could significantly impact the project schedule, and potentially result in the state incurring significant costs due to the outage (e.g. Penalty Pay).
Mitigation: Right Specific Disaster Protection Planning. Having worked with many state clients with similar legacy systems, we have the expertise to assess potential failure points for uncommon natural disasters, and more common infrastructure, system, and configuration failures. In the pre-award planning phase, we will conduct a risk assessment of the AKSAS and AKPAY environments to identify potential failure points, then identify and implement risk mitigation strategies to guard against this risk.

Risk 7: Severe – The ERP is designed to serve a broad market audience. Products designed to support manufacturing, retail, and other commercial environments must consider the needs of all these industries when planning future enhancements. Alaska would compete for the limited R&D resources to maintain, sustain, and enhance the product, and be forced to develop workarounds to meet legislative mandates and federal directives.
Mitigation: Right Future. Every dollar we spend on R&D is focused on government best practices and requirements. Alaska will be nominated to our User Steering Committee, and will have a much stronger voice in defining the future direction of new ERP releases. Alaska benefits when enhancements to the baseline ERP are provided to all clients (e.g. to meet federal directives), and has the option to implement customizations into the Alaska codebase to accommodate state specific requirements.

Risk 8: Severe – Not having one primary responsible party. Solutions involving independent solution integrators and separate ERP software providers introduce multiple points of responsibility, clouding the resolution of issues encountered during implementation.
Mitigation: Right Combination. Our solution provides Alaska a single point of accountability for the project. Having this single point of accountability is a major factor in contributing to our 100% success rate of implementing government ERP solutions. The best mitigation is for the vendor to be the product owner/developer, product implementer, and maintenance provider with the expertise, knowledge, and resources. This eliminates delays in communications, accessing baseline code changes, resolving technical issues, and obtaining support that often arise between separate organizations.

TM

Risk 9: Severe – A vendor approach that treats the implementation as three separate projects, each focusing on only one business area at a time. In a complex, multi-phase project, failing to clearly define the entire solution early may cause significant rework in later phases, and ultimately project failure.
Mitigation: Right Processes. Early in the project (Envision), we will create a comprehensive blueprint for the entire solution, encompassing all verified requirements, business processes, and systems affected. The blueprint provides a holistic view of the entire ERP solution, including the interface of legacy systems with the new ERP, and is used to verify that scope and objectives are met during each stage of the project. For example, the ASSET project's TimeLink system requires custom interfaces with AKSAS and AKPAY. The blueprint helps the State understand how those custom ASSET interfaces are impacted when AKSAS and AKPAY are replaced, and how we plan work to avoid major changes and disruptions later. Similarly, the blueprint helps Alaska identify other legacy systems and processes which may be affected, but to date may not have been contemplated.

Risk 10: Severe-The criticality of the tight link between AKSAS and AKPAY is not understood by the vendor. AKPAY passes personal service cost information to AKSAS. This information must continue to be exchanged during the time between retirement of AKSAS and retirement of AKPAY. Without this interface, personnel expenditure costs will not available for reporting from ERP or ALDER.
Mitigation: Right Continuity. A current and working knowledge of the legacy systems will minimize this risk when used as input to the blueprint and interface design. As part of preparing our response, we assessed the effort for existing interfaces between AKPAY and AKSAS (e.g. labor distribution); AKPAY and ALDER (e.g. employee and position transactions); AKSAS and ALDER (e.g. structure, financial, reference transactions); AKSAS, AKPAY, and ASSET (labor, hours and leave); and the HR Indicative file while including them in our approach and plan.

Risk 11: Moderate – Software License Model constrains future growth and increases cost. The true total cost of ownership can be underestimated if the State has to undergo future "re-sizing" adjustments, audits from the software vendor, or expensive upgrades.
Mitigation: Right Licensing Model. We will issue the State an enterprise license for our ERP product with no restriction on the number of users or environments to be implemented. When the need arises to expand the usage of the ERP solution, Alaska will not have any additional base ERP product license costs.

Risk 12: Moderate – Unrealistic and excessive demands for State staff during implementation and post-implementation causes delays, impacts to solution quality, and impacts to support levels. Vendors not familiar with the resource challenges present in state government often create project work plans based on faulty assumptions about the availability and capability of resources, assuming the State is able to divert key senior resources from their normal duties for extended periods of time. Additionally, these same vendors often create schedules with multiple large deliverables scheduled to be delivered at the same time or during peak work time, and with unrealistically short turn-around timeframes for approval.
Mitigation: Right Work Plan. Key state resources are highly leveraged on a day to day basis, and likely may have to perform their current job and support the project. Our approach will use their time in a targeted manner to review work products and desired process changes, and make decisions. To optimize their time, we will bring solutions rather than asking for lengthy explanations, and conduct walkthroughs with Alaska staff to make the review more efficient. Our existing, intimate knowledge of Alaska legacy systems and IT infrastructure will gives us the ability to work independently with reduced guidance or training from State staff. In addition, our structured mentor training program will prepare the AKPAY and AKSAS maintenance and operations resources (Analyst Programmers, System Programmers, Database Specialists, Data Processing Managers, etc.) to transition to the new ERP solution with minimal impact to their time. Our approach gradually transitions responsibility for maintenance and operations as each person gains sufficient proficiency. Since we provide hosting and support for our ERP, our team is also available as needed to augment state support staff further minimizing risks.

TM

VALUE ADDED

Item 1: Treasury Reciprocity Program (TRP) and Funding Potential
The TRP allows states to match vendor payments nationwide against Alaska debts. Vendor payments are offset and the funds are routed to Alaska for repayment. Three states, MD, NJ, and NY have collected over $69M in payments. A present client with similar size and budget estimates over $10M in debt collected from vendor payments. For Alaska, this includes the interface to submit and receive debt information with the U.S. Treasury, and to process offset payments in the ERP system. Alaska will realize payments in excess of $3M annually, and will have a pay back of less than one year. During the pre-award phase, a benefit funding approach will be discussed to support the implementation of this item.
Cost: $2,363,301

Item 2: Managed Services of the ERP Solution (Operations and Enhanced Maintenance).
This provides Alaska with a singular responsible contact for daily operation, issue resolution, version upgrades, Alaska specific configuration, and underlying 3rd-party software. Under an SLA, we proactively conduct performance tuning, capacity management and planning, identify future infrastructure needs as part of state planning cycles, and provide 24/7 production monitoring of the ERP system. We also provide management services for interfaces between the ERP and ALDER, ASSET, and ABS, and provide a 24/7 2nd level helpdesk. This service also provides Alaska with support for the State's disaster recovery system and three non-production systems (e.g. testing system). The benefits to Alaska include a singular point of contact and accountability for the entire ERP solution, enhanced business continuity, and 25% lower cost of ownership as a result of amortizing costs and deferring upfront expenditures. With this model, the application remains hosted within the State's data center with the State retaining control of the infrastructure and physical hardware. Collectively, this services model provides higher application stability, minimizes disruption of normal operations, and provides a level of services and support that is consistent with the critical needs of an ERP at a value-oriented price point.
Cost: Year 1 = $1,858,170 and thereafter Years 2-9 = $1,651,474 (Based on a 10-year term to be paid in annual installments at the beginning of each year).

Item 3: Enhanced "Strategic Fit" Customizations
We have identified 27 targeted customizations to our baseline ERP product, covering 84 requirements, that if implemented increase our out-of-the-box fit with Alaska requirements from 88% to 91%. These customizations will include asset management, overpayments, and leave, and will optimize the alignment and fit of our financial and payroll modules to the business needs required by Alaska.
Cost: $2,488,231

Item 4: Advanced Performance Budgeting (APB)
The retirement of the Alaska Budget System (ABS) should be considered as part of the implementation of the ERP solution. We can replace ABS with our APB solution, providing Alaska with the functionality required for comprehensive budget planning and analysis that is fully integrated with the ERP solution. APB will also provide broader budget management capabilities than currently available with ABS. Alaska gains the value of fully integrated budget planning and forecasting within the ERP, and eliminates the interface between ABS and the AKSAS and AKPAY systems, and the interfaces between ABS and the new ERP solution. This provides the legislative budget planning process with real time analysis capabilities of budgeted positions, and actual personnel costs. It provides up to date forecasting and analysis of currently encumbered and expended amounts, and the ability to easily perform "what-if" budget creation and analysis during the time-critical May through Sept re-appropriation period. The State will be able to easily analyze position vacancy rates, turnover, retirement projections, and the resulting impact to the personal services budgets. Forty-six of our clients have earned the "Distinguished Budget Presentation Award" from the Government Finance Officers Association using our APB budgeting capabilities.
Cost: $4,648,172 (This includes implementation services, license, and 10-year maintenance.)

Item 5: Grant Life Cycle Management (GLM) System
Each year Alaska departments receive and independently manage millions in grant funding. The lifecycle of a grant frequently spans multiple fiscal years and requires significant effort to track and administer successfully. Section 1512 of the American Recovery Reinvestment Act (ARRA 2009), instituted additional reporting requirements for federally funded grants that add to the overall burden. The GLM module provides Alaska with grant management capabilities ranging from identification and application, through award, execution, and closing phases. It also provides complete tracking and reporting of

TM

disbursements, expenses, overhead and indirect costs, produces ARRA required reports, and interfaces with the cost accounting module of our ERP, and the federal reporting portal (Reporting.Gov). The GLM module allows Alaska to act as either grantee or grantor, and brings uniformity across departments, increases the visibility of grant opportunities, and maximizes grant utilization. Clients using GLM have realized increased grant funding and streamlined grant management.
Cost: $655,173 (This includes implementation services, license, and 10-year maintenance.)

Item 6: Data Integrity

The success of data conversion, user acceptance testing (UAT), and overall implementation depend on the quality of legacy source data. Our expertise indicates that frequently states do not have the resources to maintain current operations, support the ERP implementation, and perform the analysis necessary to correct integrity issues prior to entering the critical UAT phase. To address this potential risk, we will provide Alaska experienced resources to research and correct integrity issues prior to the implementation of the ERP. Our knowledge of Alaska's legacy systems indicates that over the years, numerous software patches and "creative" use of data fields by end-users has introduced a number of data integrity issues. For example, the AKPAY and the WPA have an inter-system integrity issue with the job class code that identifies the position. The WPA system also employs a de-normalized database design and allows free form entry on key identifiers, such as the range and step of the recruitment. The Vendor file for AKSAS contains duplicative vendors and mistyped data elements, such as the city name where variations of the spelling of Juneau and other cities exist. With this value add service, Alaska will minimize implementation risk, and maximize the value of the ERP by resolving key integrity issues prior to implementation. The modest amount of effort required to resolve the integrity issues as part of the data conversion will mitigate many downstream risks and issues. This cost only applies to the identified systems being replaced by this base ERP implementation.
Cost: $421,770

Item 7: Expanded Analytics and Forecasting

Commissioners and administrators are tasked by the Governor's Office and Legislature to generate detailed analytical information, trending and forecasting data, often with short turnaround expectations. Our solution will use ALDER as the reporting engine, fully integrating the ERP data with historical information contained in the ALDER data warehouse to support statewide reporting. With this option, we can further extend ALDER's capabilities by adding additional advanced analytics and forecasting functionality to support predictive modeling from historical trends, current conditions, and what-if scenarios. With advanced analytics, departments will easily identify and compare historical service budgets against actual expenditures, identify amounts unexpended due to position vacancies, analyze vacancy trends due to turnover and retirement, and model predictions for upcoming fiscal years based on currently budgeted positions and incumbent range and step. This cost includes the addition of 3 ETLs and 5 additional reports.
Cost: $94,476

Item 8: Common 3rd Party Add Ons

There are a small number of Debt and Treasury and Learning Management requirements our baseline solution does not support. If these requirements are critical to the State, we have an established relationship with 3rd party providers that can deliver the required functionality. We have implemented and fully integrated these third party products for numerous other clients with a proven history of success. Alaska presently manages billions in short and long term debt and bonds. SymPro Debt and Treasury Management provides the State with a tool to efficiently manage debt service, redemptions, service providers, compliance, and reporting required for issuers of private debt and publicly traded bonds. With Debt and Treasury Management, issuers have a tool to create a comprehensive and user-friendly library of information on all outstanding obligations. Our 3rd party Learning Management System (LMS) provides Alaska with a robust education management system for all ERP modules. LMS includes creating and managing courses, enrolling participants, conducting training, collecting feedback, and managing educational material for directed (instructor led) and self-directed (participant managed) training. State staff can create individual profiles used to provide access to training and educational material, and to collect and store information related to the training modules.
Cost: SymPro Debt and Treasury $555,210; LMS $877,727 (Both include implementation services, license, and 10-year maintenance.)

TM

PROJECT WORK PLAN

1. METHODOLOGY FOR MANAGING PROJECT SCOPE, SCHEDULE, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT: We know that the State of Alaska (the State), while similar in many dimensions to other states, has a unique combination of systems, business processes, requirements, culture, and geography. We have a unique understanding of these specific elements and proven expertise in managing, implementing, transitioning, training, and maintaining ERP solutions specifically for governments. We will use our ERP COTS Implementation Methodology (E-CIM) to manage this project. E-CIM combines industry best practices for project management (e.g., PMBOK, IEEE, CMMI, ISO) with a structured, four-phase implementation model derived from breakthrough performance concepts. The four phases are Envision, Create, Achieve, and Support. E-CIM spans the full project lifecycle, and includes processes, templates, and tools for managing scope, schedule, budget, and daily implementation activities. We will tailor E-CIM specifically for the State using knowledge gained from our past projects with multiple, major Alaska departments. This section provides a high-level summary of our approach.

Managing Scope – Developing a perfect project plan at the outset, and expecting that plan to remain static is unrealistic for a project with this level of complexity. Changes will arise that must be accommodated and addressed for a successful outcome. Consistent requirements traceability is critical, and a foundation of our E-CIM methodology. During the E-CIM Envision phase, we will collaborate with the State to confirm requirements, and use our collective knowledge of the state legacy systems and processes to produce a clear project plan and solution blueprint. This blueprint provides a comprehensive picture of the entire ERP solution (including baseline requirements, interfaces, data sources, configuration decisions, and hardware infrastructure) very early in the project. Developing this comprehensive picture early is the only way to effectively manage the project, and minimize the implications of scope changes that often materialize months later. E-CIM is highly flexible and built to accommodate new, time-sensitive requirements often introduced by external forces ([redacted]). We address these inevitable changes in a disciplined, methodical fashion. During the pre-award phase, we will clearly document our mutual understanding of scope. During the post-award implementation phase, our scope management processes will be used to analyze, document, and implement any agreed changes.

Managing Schedule – We will manage and control the comprehensive work plan, including State activities and ours. The project Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and schedule will be refined and validated during the pre-award phase, and will be the vehicle for our schedule management activities. The work plan defines schedule, responsibility, and accountability at the individual team member level, and is sufficiently granular to manage tasks and resources without being cumbersome to create and maintain. The work plan encompasses all aspects of the project, and breaks the work into discrete phases, groupings, and tasks. Day-to-day project activities and dependencies between and within the phases will be clearly identified. We will baseline the schedule at the end of pre-award, and start tracking actual versus estimated effort. We report progress at the individual task level with team leads, group leads, and senior project management verifying the results. The work plan will be visible to all staff, and a dashboard will be provided to senior management and the project steering committee for project visibility.

Managing Implementation - The State needs a vendor that emphasizes project management, organizes tasks based on proven experience assigns work to the right staff, manages the work activities, and provides adequate visibility and reporting to the State's Project Steering Committee. Our governance structure will define roles and responsibilities, decision rights, performance measures, and escalation procedures consistent with Attachment L (L-3). Our iterative, waterfall approach has regular checkpoints to assess quality, and address issues and risks. Our management team will remove obstacles, and confirm that team members have access to the resources, information, and material needed to complete their work. Project management will also coordinate with external project stakeholders, monitor progress and quality, report status to the Steering Committee, and facilitate issue resolution. Members will perform work in accordance with the schedule and identify issues and risks as appropriate. Group and team leads will monitor performance, conduct quality reviews, and verify completed tasks. Our Go/No-Go readiness assessment determines when to proceed with cutover activities.

2. APPROACH FOR MANAGING ERP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES. History has clearly shown that it takes more than the right ERP product to succeed. The State also needs the right team and the right approach. We will bring experienced senior staff to the State that has led successful statewide ERP projects. One of our key differentiators is that we bring both deep implementation and specific knowledge

GB

of Alaska's business and legacy systems. This unique blend of expertise reduces risk.

System Initialization - This activity coincides with the E-CIM Envision phase and includes confirming requirements, identifying optimal configuration to enable business processes, assigning individual project tasks, coordinating activities, and monitoring and reporting quality and progress. During System Initialization, we will confirm the technical infrastructure and business process strategy, conduct benchmarking, define cost effective solutions for performance and scalability, and recommend the right hardware infrastructure and configuration required to implement and support the new ERP. The agreed upon technical infrastructure will also be prepared during initialization.

System Installation - The activities of analyzing the requirements for rack space, power, air conditioning, connectivity, operating system configuration, and integrating with the State's Tivoli backup system will be coordinated with the project team and the State's ETS division. System installation encompasses the hardware and software environments needed to support BPR, configuration, testing, training, conversion, and production activities across all phases. A comprehensive installation test is performed on all environments prior to release to the project team and the Installation Certification Document is prepared and submitted.

Business Process Design/Reengineering - This full lifecycle activity uses interactive BPR sessions to map current as-is processes to government best practices and our solution capabilities. System configuration options and as-is business processes will be reviewed with stakeholders in each functional area to identify improvement opportunities, and reduce customizations. We will work with the State to meet business requirements using the baseline product and configuration, rather than new code. Our BPR approach includes two key tenets: 1) include all business processes when creating the solution blueprint and planning the deployment; and 2) use our Alaska and public sector experience to assess the impact of potential process changes on policies, statutes, process integrity, and information access.

System Configuration - System configuration activities are performed throughout the project and include configuration training, selecting and implementing configuration options, and delivering comprehensive configuration documentation. System settings and configuration options necessary for each business area (referenced in Sample Configuration Plan) are also included. A baseline configuration environment will be established and maintained with current system configuration settings. This environment will be updated and maintained by authorized staff throughout the project and will serve as the "gold standard" for updating other environments as needed.

System Tailoring – We will use a four-pronged approach to tailor our solution: 1) provide an out-of-the-box COTS solution meeting at least 88% of the State's requirements based on our preliminary assessment, 2) provide a comprehensive set of configuration capabilities to implement existing processes and facilitate future upgrades, 3) leverage BPR to realign state business processes with government best practices embedded within our ERP, and 4) wherever possible, incorporate the State's software customizations into our baseline COTS product to reduce the cost of maintenance and future upgrades. During pre-award, we will work with the State's SMEs to understand the intent for requirements marked as "not met" in Exhibit F. As with our other implementations, we are confident that with this interaction, along with our proposed value added services, we can achieve a 100% fit.

Interface Design and Development – During pre-award, we will confirm our understanding of the existing interfaces, data they exchange, and their operating patterns. We will develop a set of interface specifications based on our past experience with the AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA, and other legacy systems. We will produce an interface map detailing how and when each interface is transitioned to the ERP, which interfaces are retired, the number of interfaces to be created, and any temporary interfaces to be used during the phased implementation (e.g. AKPAY to ERP for personal services information). We will use our standard data integration tool to develop the system interfaces based on the approved interface specifications. We will test and validate the operation of the interfaces against the ERP, and 3rd party interfaces which can be problematic, and coordinate the transition of the interfaces from legacy systems to the new ERP.

Data Conversion – We have extensive experience with the data models and structures of the AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA and supporting legacy systems. We will develop a Conversion Plan that maps the data between the legacy data sources and the new ERP. These maps define transformation (including data typing) and validation rules to be applied during the conversion process. Sample conversion runs are performed to verify the process and rules, and identify data quality issues. The conversion process will target current and prior year information from AKSAS, and current information from AKPAY and WPA.

Historical data will remain in ALDER. Once in production, the ERP will feed data to ALDER.

Testing - We will develop a comprehensive Test Plan outlining the approach, testing activities, data requirements, and test reporting activities. We will leverage a repository of existing public sector and scenario-based scripts, and develop new scripts, all traced back to baseline requirements. Scripts will cover system, integration, performance, and acceptance testing. We will use production-level data to validate the business functionality and system performance capabilities of the technical environment. Our testing tools will provide visibility related to progress and results. We will work with the State to define a clear set of Go/No Go criteria for system acceptance.

Post-implementation Stabilization - This activity starts with developing the Go Live and Stabilization Plan. This plan includes mutually agreed upon criteria for moving into production, a readiness checklist, and tasks and resource assignments for Go Live. The Go Live Plan also includes a data load plan for conversion. A rollback contingency plan will be developed in the unlikely event that significant problems occur following cutover. In addition to the configured and tested software solution, we will provide in-depth functional and technical training and knowledge transfer, comprehensive training materials, ERP documentation, and transition support to the ETS team. Our transition team will provide initial maintenance and stabilization services as each phase is implemented, and will remain on-site until each phase is complete.

3. TRANSITION FROM EXISTING TO PROPOSED SYSTEMS. We will execute system transition tasks within each project phase and across the entire project lifecycle based on a comprehensive Transition Plan coordinated with the State's business and technical staff. A key differentiator of our approach is "just-in-time" software licensing and installation. Licenses for operating systems, databases, and ERP modules are obtained and used as needed, and no earlier, resulting in significant acquisition and maintenance cost savings. The Transition Plan describes steps required to transition from legacy systems to the new ERP, including software, infrastructure, data, staff readiness, and staff functional and technical training. The team will conduct mock conversions to verify readiness, and confirm data quality. Our plan is based on realistic implementation dates, including fiscal year end, annual close, and other key dates. After Go Live, we will transition solution maintenance and support to the State's Help Desk.

4. EDUCATE AND TRAIN STATE EMPLOYEES ON THE PROPOSED SYSTEMS. We use a holistic approach to education and training, knowledge transfer, and skill development by addressing the needs of end users, systems and technical staff, senior management, and other stakeholders. We will develop a comprehensive Training Plan defining the training curriculum, training materials, delivery methods, instructors and attendees, schedule, and tools. Our approach will incorporate the State's unique geographic challenges, staff and facility availability, and scheduling constraints. Education and training for key functional and technical staff will begin in the pre-award phase and continue throughout the project, expanding to end user groups prior to Go Live. We will use a train-the-trainer approach with a combination of formal classroom training in Juneau and other state training facilities, distance learning, and computer-based training. We will also provide a complete set of functional and technical training materials and Quick Reference Guides tailored to the State of Alaska implementation.

5. MONITOR PERFORMANCE THROUGHOUT THE CONTRACT TERM. A key to managing large complex projects is selecting the right attributes to measure and monitor. Those activities controlling critical path, or containing significant risk or complex dependencies, must be monitored and measured. Performance measures will be focused on the actual product and solution, not the work by-products created during the project. Installing the solution, completing configuration, and completing data conversion are examples of key project milestones against which performance can readily be measured. Our E-CIM methodology leverages PMBOK-based principles and includes proactive processes, reusable templates, and dashboard tools to monitor performance, and provide exception-based reporting and visibility to internal and external stakeholders. We will establish mutually agreed upon key performance indicators with the State at the on-set. We will also conduct project health reporting using specific methods, tools, and quantifiable measures (e.g., cost and schedule variance reporting) to clearly indicate status, and manage change, risks, and issues. Project status will always be visible to the State, and monitored by our corporate Project Management Office through a mandatory monthly client engagement health check process. A Weekly Risk Report (WRR) will be prepared and if any project health issues arise, corrective actions will be implemented. Corrective measures may include additional reporting and monitoring, and/or additional executive oversight of the engagement. This process has produced a perfect ERP implementation track record – truly the lowest risk delivery method.

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk 1: Critical – The product selected as the foundation is not specifically suited for use in the public sector. This leads to compromising functional requirements and excessive customizations diluting the value of the ERP and leading to increased risk for schedule slippage and cost overruns. In a Southern California school district, after a delayed rollout and cost overruns, the district concluded, "It can't be fixed. They need to change the system, dump...and come up with a system that deals with [public sector] payroll only."
Mitigation: Right product. Implement a solution that has been successfully implemented in over 190 states, state departments, municipalities, and other government organizations. Our product's native alignment to Alaska's requirements results in an 88% out-of-the-box fit. With our proposed value added services and BPR, we can achieve a 100% fit.

Risk 2: Critical – The vendor team lacks implementation knowledge and specifics on Alaska systems. Inexperienced staff underestimates complexities, and fails to understand the scope and breadth of critical system interfaces, resulting in poor project scheduling, resourcing and staffing estimates. In August 2010, a California Bay Area county was forced to "rip and replace" its ailing ERP system which after four years of implementation met only 50% of the functionality required. The county complaint stated the vendor used the project as a "trial and error" training ground for inexperienced staff.
Mitigation: Right Team. Our project team only implements our ERP product; each of our key project team members has successfully implemented our product in multiple states. Collectively, our team brings over 75+ years of field experience successfully implementing our product. Specifically, our project manager has implemented our product in 6 states. Our business/functional lead has also implemented our product in multiple states. Our DW/Reporting lead has extensive experience with other State of Alaska Departments the specific systems (AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA) that the new ERP is replacing, and Alaska's data warehouse and reporting solution (ALDER). Our project team, senior management, and system staff (which build and maintain our ERP product) bring Alaska a highly seasoned, proven team with a deep understanding of public sector ERP systems and direct Alaska experience.

Risk 3: Critical – Vendors without a standard methodology adapted specifically to the unique needs of Alaska will be unable to create and execute a realistic and achievable plan. The multi-phased implementation of an ERP is a complex undertaking requiring a comprehensive, proven approach to completing the project. This risk will result in key activities being omitted, an underestimate of the level of effort, and unrealistic time commitments for key State staff. The lack of a standard methodology tailored specifically to the needs of the State of Alaska will jeopardize project value, increase costs, and introduce unnecessary risk.
Mitigation: Right Methodology/Approach. Our estimates are based on factual historical metrics collected from over 190 implementations of our product in the state and local government space. For Alaska, we have crafted a comprehensive approach based on our in-depth understanding of the State's business environment, staff, and legacy systems. We validated our Alaska plan for completeness and accuracy against these historical metrics. We recognize that the implementation process is not a sprint and must make efficient use of resources over a period of years not weeks. Knowing state resources must continue supporting the business, legacy systems, and other time sensitive requests (e.g., implementing fund categories to meet GASB reporting requirements), our approach targets participation of state resources in a focused and balanced manner. This is the right approach to reduce the risk of schedule delays caused by unrealistic or uninformed expectations of state resource time and participation levels.

Risk 4: Critical – Attempting to integrate an ERP's standard reporting tool alongside or in place of ALDER increases implementation risk, reduces user efficiency, limits enterprise data access, increases maintenance and operations costs, and potentially jeopardize business continuity. As stated in the RFP, the new solution must be integrated with ALDER to support historical and current transactional reporting. ALDER is a complex and powerful reporting tool and integration is complex.
Mitigation: Right use of ALDER by integrating to the ERP solution. Instead of relegating ALDER to a historical only repository or replacing it, our solution is to utilize ALDER as **the** reporting tool for ERP. This fully leverages Alaska's investment and takes advantage of ALDER's widespread adoption. Data

from our ERP solution will be loaded into the ALDER database and historical and current financial transaction reporting is done through ALDER's Business Objects front end. This will provide a statewide view of financial, procurement, and human resources data. As a result, Alaska staff will require minimal training on the new reports, and have broader access to strategic ERP data. Our approach to ALDER as the reporting solution reduces license, maintenance and operating costs, while also reducing implementation risk and increasing user satisfaction and adoption of the new ERP system.

Risk 5: Severe – Not staffing for a multi-year project the size and complexity of Alaska ERP (which is more critical than for small, short duration, narrowly focused projects). Large, complex ERP projects require staff committed to the entire project lifecycle to avoid the risks associated with staff turnover – particularly of key senior staff. This turnover impacts timely and efficient decision making, compromises team collaboration, and impacts project schedule.
Mitigation: Right Staff Plan. We understand firsthand the unique challenges and costs of staffing a long-term project in Alaska with SMEs from other parts of the U.S. Climate, culture, and distance combine to create a unique set of project challenges in Alaska. We are committing one of our most seasoned, experienced, and dedicated project managers who has started and successfully finished all six of the previous ERP projects she has managed. Additionally our project manager will relocate to Juneau for the duration of the project to maximize time on-site, and to support effective collaboration with Alaska. Our functional/technical SMEs will work onsite for efficient collaboration and direct interaction with state staff. When appropriate, they will work remotely to minimize travel costs. We have successfully applied this same distributed project team structure on other complex Alaska projects. Additionally, we have added a top ranked local Alaska IT partner with state systems experience and resources on the ground in Juneau to augment our data conversion activities and local on-site presence.

- WK on other comple AR

Risk 6: Severe – The tight linkage between AKSAS and AKPAY raises the risk of failure when an existing linkage is replaced in Phase 1 with the new ERP financial module. As described in the 2006 Business Case, a natural disaster (or system failure) impacting AKSAS or AKPAY during the implementation of the ERP could significantly impact the project schedule, and potentially result in the state incurring significant costs due to the outage (e.g. Penalty Pay).
Mitigation: Right Specific Disaster Protection Planning. Having worked with many state clients with similar legacy systems, we have the expertise to assess potential failure points for uncommon natural disasters, and more common infrastructure, system, and configuration failures. In the pre-award planning phase, we will conduct a risk assessment of the AKSAS and AKPAY environments to identify potential failure points, then identify and implement risk mitigation strategies to guard against this risk.

Risk 7: Severe – The ERP is designed to serve a broad market audience. Products designed to support manufacturing, retail, and other commercial environments must consider the needs of all these industries when planning future enhancements. Alaska would compete for the limited R&D resources to maintain, sustain, and enhance the product, and be forced to develop workarounds to meet legislative mandates and federal directives.
Mitigation: Right Future. Every dollar we spend on R&D is focused on government best practices and requirements. Alaska will be nominated to our User Steering Committee, and will have a much stronger voice in defining the future direction of new ERP releases. Alaska benefits when enhancements to the baseline ERP are provided to all clients (e.g. to meet federal directives), and has the option to implement customizations into the Alaska codebase to accommodate state specific requirements.

Risk 8: Severe – Not having one primary responsible party. Solutions involving independent solution integrators and separate ERP software providers introduce multiple points of responsibility, clouding the resolution of issues encountered during implementation.
Mitigation: Right Combination. Our solution provides Alaska a single point of accountability for the project. Having this single point of accountability is a major factor in contributing to our 100% success rate of implementing government ERP solutions. The best mitigation is for the vendor to be the product owner/developer, product implementer, and maintenance provider with the expertise, knowledge, and resources. This eliminates delays in communications, accessing baseline code changes, resolving technical issues, and obtaining support that often arise between separate organizations.

SB

Risk 9: Severe – A vendor approach that treats the implementation as three separate projects, each focusing on only one business area at a time. In a complex, multi-phase project, failing to clearly define the entire solution early may cause significant rework in later phases, and ultimately project failure.
Mitigation: Right Processes. Early in the project (Envision), we will create a comprehensive blueprint for the entire solution, encompassing all verified requirements, business processes, and systems affected. The blueprint provides a holistic view of the entire ERP solution, including the interface of legacy systems with the new ERP, and is used to verify that scope and objectives are met during each stage of the project. For example, the ASSET project's TimeLink system requires custom interfaces with AKSAS and AKPAY. The blueprint helps the State understand how those custom ASSET interfaces are impacted when AKSAS and AKPAY are replaced, and how we plan work to avoid major changes and disruptions later. Similarly, the blueprint helps Alaska identify other legacy systems and processes which may be affected, but to date may not have been contemplated.

Risk 10: Severe-The criticality of the tight link between AKSAS and AKPAY is not understood by the vendor. AKPAY passes personal service cost information to AKSAS. This information must continue to be exchanged during the time between retirement of AKSAS and retirement of AKPAY. Without this interface, personnel expenditure costs will not available for reporting from ERP or ALDER.
Mitigation: Right Continuity. A current and working knowledge of the legacy systems will minimize this risk when used as input to the blueprint and interface design. As part of preparing our response, we assessed the effort for existing interfaces between AKPAY and AKSAS (e.g. labor distribution); AKPAY and ALDER (e.g. employee and position transactions); AKSAS and ALDER (e.g. structure, financial, reference transactions); AKSAS, AKPAY, and ASSET (labor, hours and leave); and the HR Indicative file while including them in our approach and plan.

Risk 11: Moderate – Software License Model constrains future growth and increases cost. The true total cost of ownership can be underestimated if the State has to undergo future "re-sizing" adjustments, audits from the software vendor, or expensive upgrades.
Mitigation: Right Licensing Model. We will issue the State an enterprise license for our ERP product with no restriction on the number of users or environments to be implemented. When the need arises to expand the usage of the ERP solution, Alaska will not have any additional base ERP product license costs.

Risk 12: Moderate – Unrealistic and excessive demands for State staff during implementation and post-implementation causes delays, impacts to solution quality, and impacts to support levels. Vendors not familiar with the resource challenges present in state government often create project work plans based on faulty assumptions about the availability and capability of resources, assuming the State is able to divert key senior resources from their normal duties for extended periods of time. Additionally, these same vendors often create schedules with multiple large deliverables scheduled to be delivered at the same time or during peak work time, and with unrealistically short turn-around timeframes for approval.
Mitigation: Right Work Plan. Key state resources are highly leveraged on a day to day basis, and likely may have to perform their current job and support the project. Our approach will use their time in a targeted manner to review work products and desired process changes, and make decisions. To optimize their time, we will bring solutions rather than asking for lengthy explanations, and conduct walkthroughs with Alaska staff to make the review more efficient. Our existing, intimate knowledge of Alaska legacy systems and IT infrastructure will gives us the ability to work independently with reduced guidance or training from State staff. In addition, our structured mentor training program will prepare the AKPAY and AKSAS maintenance and operations resources (Analyst Programmers, System Programmers, Database Specialists, Data Processing Managers, etc.) to transition to the new ERP solution with minimal impact to their time. Our approach gradually transitions responsibility for maintenance and operations as each person gains sufficient proficiency. Since we provide hosting and support for our ERP, our team is also available as needed to augment state support staff further minimizing risks.

12

8B

VALUE ADDED

Item 1: Treasury Reciprocity Program (TRP) and Funding Potential
The TRP allows states to match vendor payments nationwide against Alaska debts. Vendor payments are offset and the funds are routed to Alaska for repayment. Three states, MD, NJ, and NY have collected over $69M in payments. A present client with similar size and budget estimates over $10M in debt collected from vendor payments. For Alaska, this includes the interface to submit and receive debt information with the U.S. Treasury, and to process offset payments in the ERP system. Alaska will realize payments in excess of $3M annually, and will have a pay back of less than one year. During the pre-award phase, a benefit funding approach will be discussed to support the implementation of this item.
Cost: $2,363,301

Item 2: Managed Services of the ERP Solution (Operations and Enhanced Maintenance).
This provides Alaska with a singular responsible contact for daily operation, issue resolution, version upgrades, Alaska specific configuration, and underlying 3rd-party software. Under an SLA, we proactively conduct performance tuning, capacity management and planning, identify future infrastructure needs as part of state planning cycles, and provide 24/7 production monitoring of the ERP system. We also provide management services for interfaces between the ERP and ALDER, ASSET, and ABS, and provide a 24/7 2nd level helpdesk. This service also provides Alaska with support for the State's disaster recovery system and three non-production systems (e.g. testing system). The benefits to Alaska include a singular point of contact and accountability for the entire ERP solution, enhanced business continuity, and 25% lower cost of ownership as a result of amortizing costs and deferring upfront expenditures. With this model, the application remains hosted within the State's data center with the State retaining control of the infrastructure and physical hardware. Collectively, this services model provides higher application stability, minimizes disruption of normal operations, and provides a level of services and support that is consistent with the critical needs of an ERP at a value-oriented price point.
Cost: Year 1 = $1,858,170 and thereafter Years 2-9 = $1,651,474 (Based on a 10-year term to be paid in annual installments at the beginning of each year).

Item 3: Enhanced "Strategic Fit" Customizations
We have identified 27 targeted customizations to our baseline ERP product, covering 84 requirements, that if implemented increase our out-of-the-box fit with Alaska requirements from 88% to 91%. These customizations will include asset management, overpayments, and leave, and will optimize the alignment and fit of our financial and payroll modules to the business needs required by Alaska.
Cost: $2,488,231

Item 4: Advanced Performance Budgeting (APB)
The retirement of the Alaska Budget System (ABS) should be considered as part of the implementation of the ERP solution. We can replace ABS with our APB solution, providing Alaska with the functionality required for comprehensive budget planning and analysis that is fully integrated with the ERP solution. APB will also provide broader budget management capabilities than currently available with ABS. Alaska gains the value of fully integrated budget planning and forecasting within the ERP, and eliminates the interface between ABS and the AKSAS and AKPAY systems, and the interfaces between ABS and the new ERP solution. This provides the legislative budget planning process with real time analysis capabilities of budgeted positions, and actual personnel costs. It provides up to date forecasting and analysis of currently encumbered and expended amounts, and the ability to easily perform "what-if" budget creation and analysis during the time-critical May through Sept re-appropriation period. The State will be able to easily analyze position vacancy rates, turnover, retirement projections, and the resulting impact to the personal services budgets. Forty-six of our clients have earned the "Distinguished Budget Presentation Award" from the Government Finance Officers Association using our APB budgeting capabilities.
Cost: $4,648,172 (This includes implementation services, license, and 10-year maintenance.)

Item 5: Grant Life Cycle Management (GLM) System
Each year Alaska departments receive and independently manage millions in grant funding. The lifecycle of a grant frequently spans multiple fiscal years and requires significant effort to track and administer successfully. Section 1512 of the American Recovery Reinvestment Act (ARRA 2009), instituted additional reporting requirements for federally funded grants that add to the overall burden. The GLM module provides Alaska with grant management capabilities ranging from identification and application, through award, execution, and closing phases. It also provides complete tracking and reporting of

SB

CGI

PROJECT WORK PLAN

1. METHODOLOGY FOR MANAGING PROJECT SCOPE, SCHEDULE, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT: We know that the State of Alaska (the State), while similar in many dimensions to other states, has a unique combination of systems, business processes, requirements, culture, and geography. We have a unique understanding of these specific elements and proven expertise in managing, implementing, transitioning, training, and maintaining ERP solutions specifically for governments. We will use our ERP COTS Implementation Methodology (E-CIM) to manage this project. E-CIM combines industry best practices for project management (e.g., PMBOK, IEEE, CMMI, ISO) with a structured, four-phase implementation model derived from breakthrough performance concepts. The four phases are Envision, Create, Achieve, and Support. E-CIM spans the full project lifecycle, and includes processes, templates, and tools for managing scope, schedule, budget, and daily implementation activities. We will tailor E-CIM specifically for the State using knowledge gained from our past projects with multiple, major Alaska departments. This section provides a high-level summary of our approach.

Managing Scope – Developing a perfect project plan at the outset, and expecting that plan to remain static is unrealistic for a project with this level of complexity. Changes will arise that must be accommodated and addressed for a successful outcome. Consistent requirements traceability is critical, and a foundation of our E-CIM methodology. During the E-CIM Envision phase, we will collaborate with the State to confirm requirements, and use our collective knowledge of the state legacy systems and processes to produce a clear project plan and solution blueprint. This blueprint provides a comprehensive picture of the entire ERP solution (including baseline requirements, interfaces, data sources, configuration decisions, and hardware infrastructure) very early in the project. Developing this comprehensive picture early is the only way to effectively manage the project, and minimize the implications of scope changes that often materialize months later. E-CIM is highly flexible and built to accommodate new, time-sensitive requirements often introduced by external forces ([redacted]). We address these inevitable changes in a disciplined, methodical fashion. During the pre-award phase, we will clearly document our mutual understanding of scope. During the post-award implementation phase, our scope management processes will be used to analyze, document, and implement any agreed changes.

Managing Schedule – We will manage and control the comprehensive work plan, including State activities and ours. The project Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and schedule will be refined and validated during the pre-award phase, and will be the vehicle for our schedule management activities. The work plan defines schedule, responsibility, and accountability at the individual team member level, and is sufficiently granular to manage tasks and resources without being cumbersome to create and maintain. The work plan encompasses all aspects of the project, and breaks the work into discrete phases, groupings, and tasks. Day-to-day project activities and dependencies between and within the phases will be clearly identified. We will baseline the schedule at the end of pre-award, and start tracking actual versus estimated effort. We report progress at the individual task level with team leads, group leads, and senior project management verifying the results. The work plan will be visible to all staff, and a dashboard will be provided to senior management and the project steering committee for project visibility.

Managing Implementation - The State needs a vendor that emphasizes project management, organizes tasks based on proven experience, assigns work to the right staff, manages the work activities, and provides adequate visibility and reporting to the State's Project Steering Committee. Our governance structure will define roles and responsibilities, decision rights, performance measures, and escalation procedures consistent with Attachment L (L-3). Our iterative, waterfall approach has regular checkpoints to assess quality, and address issues and risks. Our management team will remove obstacles, and confirm that team members have access to the resources, information, and material needed to complete their work. Project management will also coordinate with external project stakeholders, monitor progress and quality, report status to the Steering Committee, and facilitate issue resolution. Members will perform work in accordance with the schedule and identify issues and risks as appropriate. Group and team leads will monitor performance, conduct quality reviews, and verify completed tasks. Our Go/No-Go readiness assessment determines when to proceed with cutover activities.

2. APPROACH FOR MANAGING ERP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES. History has clearly shown that it takes more than the right ERP product to succeed. The State also needs the right team and the right approach. We will bring experienced senior staff to the State that has led successful statewide ERP projects. One of our key differentiators is that we bring both deep implementation and specific knowledge

BL

of Alaska's business and legacy systems. This unique blend of expertise reduces risk.

System Initialization - This activity coincides with the E-CIM Envision phase and includes confirming requirements, identifying optimal configuration to enable business processes, assigning individual project tasks, coordinating activities, and monitoring and reporting quality and progress. During System Initialization, we will confirm the technical infrastructure and business process strategy, conduct benchmarking, define cost effective solutions for performance and scalability, and recommend the right hardware infrastructure and configuration required to implement and support the new ERP. The agreed upon technical infrastructure will also be prepared during initialization.

System Installation - The activities of analyzing the requirements for rack space, power, air conditioning, connectivity, operating system configuration, and integrating with the State's Tivoli backup system will be coordinated with the project team and the State's ETS division. System installation encompasses the hardware and software environments needed to support BPR, configuration, testing, training, conversion, and production activities across all phases. A comprehensive installation test is performed on all environments prior to release to the project team and the Installation Certification Document is prepared and submitted.

Business Process Design/Reengineering - This full lifecycle activity uses interactive BPR sessions to map current as-is processes to government best practices and our solution capabilities. System configuration options and as-is business processes will be reviewed with stakeholders in each functional area to identify improvement opportunities, and reduce customizations. We will work with the State to meet business requirements using the baseline product and configuration, rather than new code. Our BPR approach includes two key tenets: 1) include all business processes when creating the solution blueprint and planning the deployment; and 2) use our Alaska and public sector experience to assess the impact of potential process changes on policies, statutes, process integrity, and information access.

System Configuration - System configuration activities are performed throughout the project and include configuration training, selecting and implementing configuration options, and delivering comprehensive configuration documentation. System settings and configuration options necessary for each business area (referenced in Sample Configuration Plan) are also included. A baseline configuration environment will be established and maintained with current system configuration settings. This environment will be updated and maintained by authorized staff throughout the project and will serve as the "gold standard" for updating other environments as needed.

System Tailoring – We will use a four-pronged approach to tailor our solution: 1) provide an out-of-the-box COTS solution meeting at least 88% of the State's requirements based on our preliminary assessment; 2) provide a comprehensive set of configuration capabilities to implement existing processes and facilitate future upgrades; 3) leverage BPR to realign state business processes with government best practices embedded within our ERP, and 4) wherever possible, incorporate the State's software customizations into our baseline COTS product to reduce the cost of maintenance and future upgrades. During pre-award, we will work with the State's SMEs to understand the intent for requirements marked as "not met" in Exhibit F. As with our other implementations, we are confident that with this interaction, along with our proposed value added services, we can achieve a 100% fit.

Interface Design and Development – During pre-award, we will confirm our understanding of the existing interfaces, data they exchange, and their operating patterns. We will develop a set of interface specifications based on our past experience with the AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA, and other legacy systems. We will produce an interface map detailing how and when each interface is transitioned to the ERP, which interfaces are retired, the number of interfaces to be created, and any temporary interfaces to be used during the phased implementation (e.g. AKPAY to ERP for personal services information). We will use our standard data integration tool to develop the system interfaces based on the approved interface specifications. We will test and validate the operation of the interfaces against the ERP, and 3rd party interfaces which can be problematic, and coordinate the transition of the interfaces from legacy systems to the new ERP.

Data Conversion – We have extensive experience with the data models and structures of the AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA and supporting legacy systems. We will develop a Conversion Plan that maps the data between the legacy data sources and the new ERP. These maps define transformation (including data typing) and validation rules to be applied during the conversion process. Sample conversion runs are performed to verify the process and rules, and identify data quality issues. The conversion process will target current and prior year information from AKSAS, and current information from AKPAY and WPA.

BL

Historical data will remain in ALDER. Once in production, the ERP will feed data to ALDER.

Testing - We will develop a comprehensive Test Plan outlining the approach, testing activities, data requirements, and test reporting activities. We will leverage a repository of existing public sector and scenario-based scripts, and develop new scripts, all traced back to baseline requirements. Scripts will cover system, integration, performance, and acceptance testing. We will use production-level data to validate the business functionality and system performance capabilities of the technical environment. Our testing tools will provide visibility related to progress and results. We will work with the State to define a clear set of Go/No Go criteria for system acceptance.

Post-implementation Stabilization - This activity starts with developing the Go Live and Stabilization Plan. This plan includes mutually agreed upon criteria for moving into production, a readiness checklist, and tasks and resource assignments for Go Live. The Go Live Plan also includes a data load plan for conversion. A rollback contingency plan will be developed in the unlikely event that significant problems occur following cutover. In addition to the configured and tested software solution, we will provide in-depth functional and technical training and knowledge transfer, comprehensive training materials, ERP documentation, and transition support to the ETS team. Our transition team will provide initial maintenance and stabilization services as each phase is implemented, and will remain on-site until each phase is complete.

3. TRANSITION FROM EXISTING TO PROPOSED SYSTEMS. We will execute system transition tasks within each project phase and across the entire project lifecycle based on a comprehensive Transition Plan coordinated with the State's business and technical staff. A key differentiator of our approach is "just-in-time" software licensing and installation. Licenses for operating systems, databases, and ERP modules are obtained and used as needed, and no earlier, resulting in significant acquisition and maintenance cost savings. The Transition Plan describes steps required to transition from legacy systems to the new ERP, including software, infrastructure, data, staff readiness, and staff functional and technical training. The team will conduct mock conversions to verify readiness, and confirm data quality. Our plan is based on realistic implementation dates, including fiscal year end, annual close, and other key dates. After Go Live, we will transition solution maintenance and support to the State's Help Desk.

4. EDUCATE AND TRAIN STATE EMPLOYEES ON THE PROPOSED SYSTEMS. We use a holistic approach to education and training, knowledge transfer, and skill development by addressing the needs of end users, systems and technical staff, senior management, and other stakeholders. We will develop a comprehensive Training Plan defining the training curriculum, training materials, delivery methods, instructors and attendees, schedule, and tools. Our approach will incorporate the State's unique geographic challenges, staff and facility availability, and scheduling constraints. Education and training for key functional and technical staff will begin in the pre-award phase and continue throughout the project, expanding to end user groups prior to Go Live. We will use a train-the-trainer approach with a combination of formal classroom training in Juneau and other state training facilities, distance learning, and computer-based training. We will also provide a complete set of functional and technical training materials and Quick Reference Guides tailored to the State of Alaska implementation.

5. MONITOR PERFORMANCE THROUGHOUT THE CONTRACT TERM. A key to managing large complex projects is selecting the right attributes to measure and monitor. Those activities controlling critical path, or containing significant risk or complex dependencies, must be monitored and measured. Performance measures will be focused on the actual product and solution, not the work by-products created during the project. Installing the solution, completing configuration, and completing data conversion are examples of key project milestones against which performance can readily be measured. Our E-CIM methodology leverages PMBOK-based principles and includes proactive processes, reusable templates, and dashboard tools to monitor performance, and provide exception-based reporting and visibility to internal and external stakeholders. We will establish mutually agreed upon key performance indicators with the State at the on-set. We will also conduct project health reporting using specific methods, tools, and quantifiable measures (e.g., cost and schedule variance reporting) to clearly indicate status, and manage change, risks, and issues. Project status will always be visible to the State, and monitored by our corporate Project Management Office through a mandatory monthly client engagement health check process. A Weekly Risk Report (WRR) will be prepared and if any project health issues arise, corrective actions will be implemented. Corrective measures may include additional reporting and monitoring, and/or additional executive oversight of the engagement. This process has produced a perfect ERP implementation track record – truly the lowest risk delivery method.

BL

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk 1: Critical – The product selected as the foundation is not specifically suited for use in the public sector. This leads to compromising functional requirements and excessive customizations diluting the value of the ERP and leading to increased risk for schedule slippage and cost overruns. In a Southern California school district, after a delayed rollout and cost overruns, the district concluded, "It can't be fixed. They need to change the system, dump... and come up with a system that deals with [public sector] payroll only."
Mitigation: Right product. Implement a solution that has been successfully implemented in over 190 states, state departments, municipalities, and other government organizations. Our product's native alignment to Alaska's requirements results in an 88% out-of-the-box fit. With our proposed value added services and BPR, we can achieve a 100% fit.

Risk 2: Critical – The vendor team lacks implementation knowledge and specifics on Alaska systems. Inexperienced staff underestimates complexities, and fails to understand the scope and breadth of critical system interfaces, resulting in poor project scheduling, resourcing and staffing estimates. In August 2010, a California Bay Area county was forced to "rip and replace" its ailing ERP system which after four years of implementation met only 50% of the functionality required. The county complaint stated the vendor used the project as a "trial and error" training ground for inexperienced staff.
Mitigation: Right Team. Our project team only implements our ERP product; each of our key project team members has successfully implemented our product in multiple states. Collectively, our team brings over 75+ years of field experience successfully implementing our product. Specifically, our project manager has implemented our product in 6 states. Our business/functional lead has also implemented our product in multiple states. Our DW/Reporting lead has extensive experience with other State of Alaska Departments the specific systems (AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA) that the new ERP is replacing, and Alaska's data warehouse and reporting solution (ALDER). Our project team, senior management, and system staff (which build and maintain our ERP product) bring Alaska a highly seasoned, proven team with a deep understanding of public sector ERP systems and direct Alaska experience.

Risk 3: Critical – Vendors without a standard methodology adapted specifically to the unique needs of Alaska will be unable to create and execute a realistic and achievable plan. The multi-phased implementation of an ERP is a complex undertaking requiring a comprehensive, proven approach to completing the project. This risk will result in key activities being omitted, an underestimate of the level of effort, and unrealistic time commitments for key State staff. The lack of a standard methodology tailored specifically to the needs of the State of Alaska will jeopardize project value, increase costs, and introduce unnecessary risk.
Mitigation: Right Methodology/Approach. Our estimates are based on factual historical metrics collected from over 190 implementations of our product in the state and local government space. For Alaska, we have crafted a comprehensive approach based on our in-depth understanding of the State's business environment, staff, and legacy systems. We validated our Alaska plan for completeness and accuracy against these historical metrics. We recognize that the implementation process is not a sprint and must make efficient use of resources over a period of years not weeks. Knowing state resources must continue supporting the business, legacy systems, and other time sensitive requests (e.g., implementing fund categories to meet GASB reporting requirements), our approach targets participation of state resources in a focused and balanced manner. This is the right approach to reduce the risk of schedule delays caused by unrealistic or uninformed expectations of state resource time and participation levels.

Risk 4: Critical – Attempting to integrate an ERP's standard reporting tool alongside or in place of ALDER increases implementation risk, reduces user efficiency, limits enterprise data access, increases maintenance and operations costs, and potentially jeopardize business continuity. As stated in the RFP, the new solution must be integrated with ALDER to support historical and current transactional reporting. ALDER is a complex and powerful reporting tool and integration is complex.
Mitigation: Right use of ALDER by integrating to the ERP solution. Instead of relegating ALDER to a historical only repository or replacing it, our solution is to utilize ALDER as **the** reporting tool for ERP. This fully leverages Alaska's investment and takes advantage of ALDER's widespread adoption. Data

BL

from our ERP solution will be loaded into the ALDER database and historical and current financial transaction reporting is done through ALDER's Business Objects front end. This will provide a statewide view of financial, procurement, and human resources data. As a result, Alaska staff will require minimal training on the new reports, and have broader access to strategic ERP data. Our approach to ALDER as the reporting solution reduces license, maintenance and operating costs, while also reducing implementation risk and increasing user satisfaction and adoption of the new ERP system.

Risk 5: Severe – Not staffing for a multi-year project the size and complexity of Alaska ERP (which is more critical than for small, short duration, narrowly focused projects). Large, complex ERP projects require staff committed to the entire project lifecycle to avoid the risks associated with staff turnover – particularly of key senior staff. This turnover impacts timely and efficient decision making, compromises team collaboration, and impacts project schedule.
Mitigation: Right Staff Plan. We understand firsthand the unique challenges and costs of staffing a long-term project in Alaska with SMEs from other parts of the U.S. Climate, culture, and distance combine to create a unique set of project challenges in Alaska. We are committing one of our most seasoned, experienced, and dedicated project managers who has started and successfully finished all six of the previous ERP projects she has managed. Additionally our project manager will relocate to Juneau for the duration of the project to maximize time on-site, and to support effective collaboration with Alaska. Our functional/technical SMEs will work onsite for efficient collaboration and direct interaction with state staff. When appropriate, they will work remotely to minimize travel costs. We have successfully applied this same distributed project team structure on other complex Alaska projects. Additionally, we have added a top ranked local Alaska IT partner with state systems experience and resources on the ground in Juneau to augment our data conversion activities and local on-site presence.

Risk 6: Severe – The tight linkage between AKSAS and AKPAY raises the risk of failure when an existing linkage is replaced in Phase 1 with the new ERP financial module. As described in the 2006 Business Case, a natural disaster (or system failure) impacting AKSAS or AKPAY during the implementation of the ERP could significantly impact the project schedule, and potentially result in the state incurring significant costs due to the outage (e.g. Penalty Pay).
Mitigation: Right Specific Disaster Protection Planning. Having worked with many state clients with similar legacy systems, we have the expertise to assess potential failure points for uncommon natural disasters, and more common infrastructure, system, and configuration failures. In the pre-award planning phase, we will conduct a risk assessment of the AKSAS and AKPAY environments to identify potential failure points, then identify and implement risk mitigation strategies to guard against this risk.

Risk 7: Severe – The ERP is designed to serve a broad market audience. Products designed to support manufacturing, retail, and other commercial environments must consider the needs of all these industries when planning future enhancements. Alaska would compete for the limited R&D resources to maintain, sustain, and enhance the product, and be forced to develop workarounds to meet legislative mandates and federal directives.
Mitigation: Right Future. Every dollar we spend on R&D is focused on government best practices and requirements. Alaska will be nominated to our User Steering Committee, and will have a much stronger voice in defining the future direction of new ERP releases. Alaska benefits when enhancements to the baseline ERP are provided to all clients (e.g. to meet federal directives), and has the option to implement customizations into the Alaska codebase to accommodate state specific requirements.

Risk 8: Severe – Not having one primary responsible party. Solutions involving independent solution integrators and separate ERP software providers introduce multiple points of responsibility, clouding the resolution of issues encountered during implementation.
Mitigation: Right Combination. Our solution provides Alaska a single point of accountability for the project. Having this single point of accountability is a major factor in contributing to our 100% success rate of implementing government ERP solutions. The best mitigation is for the vendor to be the product owner/developer, product implementer, and maintenance provider with the expertise, knowledge, and resources. This eliminates delays in communications, accessing baseline code changes, resolving technical issues, and obtaining support that often arise between separate organizations.

BL

[redacted]	Senior Consultant	Sr. Finance/ Procurement Business Analyst	3,780	2,268	3-5	N
	Consultant	Finance/ Procurement Technical Analyst	11,167	6,700	0-3	N
	Senior Consultant	Sr. Finance/ Procurement Technical Analyst	6,888	4,123	3-5	N
	Director of Consulting	HRM Lead	4,032	3,024	5-7	N
	Consultant	HRM Technical Analyst	7,728	4,637	3-5	N
	Consultant	HRM Business Analyst	10,080	6,048	0-3	N
	Senior Consultant	Sr. HRM Technical Analyst	6,048	3,629	3-5	N
	Senior Consultant	Sr. HRM Business Consultant	4,032	2,419	3-5	N
	Business Analyst	Business Analyst	840	840	0-3	N
	Technical Analyst	Technical Analyst	13,944	13,944	0-3	N
	Warranty Services	Warrant Services	4,032	3,225	3-7	N

*** Information contained in these columns will not be provided to the PEC during evaluation.**

KEY STAFF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

CGI

PROJECT WORK PLAN

1. METHODOLOGY FOR MANAGING PROJECT SCOPE, SCHEDULE, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT: We know that the State of Alaska (the State), while similar in many dimensions to other states, has a unique combination of systems, business processes, requirements, culture, and geography. We have a unique understanding of these specific elements and proven expertise in managing, implementing, transitioning, training, and maintaining ERP solutions specifically for governments. We will use our ERP COTS Implementation Methodology (E-CIM) to manage this project. E-CIM combines industry best practices for project management (e.g., PMBOK, IEEE, CMMI, ISO) with a structured, four-phase implementation model derived from breakthrough performance concepts. The four phases are Envision, Create, Achieve, and Support. E-CIM spans the full project lifecycle, and includes processes, templates, and tools for managing scope, schedule, budget, and daily implementation activities. We will tailor E-CIM specifically for the State using knowledge gained from our past projects with multiple, major Alaska departments. This section provides a high-level summary of our approach.

Managing Scope – Developing a perfect project plan at the outset, and expecting that plan to remain static is unrealistic for a project with this level of complexity. Changes will arise that must be accommodated and addressed for a successful outcome. Consistent requirements traceability is critical, and a foundation of our E-CIM methodology. During the E-CIM Envision phase, we will collaborate with the State to confirm requirements, and use our collective knowledge of the state legacy systems and processes to produce a clear project plan and solution blueprint. This blueprint provides a comprehensive picture of the entire ERP solution (including baseline requirements, interfaces, data sources, configuration decisions, and hardware infrastructure) very early in the project. Developing this comprehensive picture early is the only way to effectively manage the project, and minimize the implications of scope changes that often materialize months later. E-CIM is highly flexible and built to accommodate new, time-sensitive requirements often introduced by external forces ([redacted]). We address these inevitable changes in a disciplined, methodical fashion. During the pre-award phase, we will clearly document our mutual understanding of scope. During the post-award implementation phase, our scope management processes will be used to analyze, document, and implement any agreed changes.

Managing Schedule – We will manage and control the comprehensive work plan, including State activities and ours. The project Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and schedule will be refined and validated during the pre-award phase, and will be the vehicle for our schedule management activities. The work plan defines schedule, responsibility, and accountability at the individual team member level, and is sufficiently granular to manage tasks and resources without being cumbersome to create and maintain. The work plan encompasses all aspects of the project, and breaks the work into discrete phases, groupings, and tasks. Day-to-day project activities and dependencies between and within the phases will be clearly identified. We will baseline the schedule at the end of pre-award, and start tracking actual versus estimated effort. We report progress at the individual task level with team leads, group leads, and senior project management verifying the results. The work plan will be visible to all staff, and a dashboard will be provided to senior management and the project steering committee for project visibility.

Managing Implementation - The State needs a vendor that emphasizes project management, organizes tasks based on proven experience, assigns work to the right staff, manages the work activities, and provides adequate visibility and reporting to the State's Project Steering Committee. Our governance structure will define roles and responsibilities, decision rights, performance measures, and escalation procedures consistent with Attachment L (L-3). Our iterative, waterfall approach has regular checkpoints to assess quality, and address issues and risks. Our management team will remove obstacles, and confirm that team members have access to the resources, information, and material needed to complete their work. Project management will also coordinate with external project stakeholders, monitor progress and quality, report status to the Steering Committee, and facilitate issue resolution. Members will perform work in accordance with the schedule and identify issues and risks as appropriate. Group and team leads will monitor performance, conduct quality reviews, and verify completed tasks. Our Go/No-Go readiness assessment determines when to proceed with cutover activities.

2. APPROACH FOR MANAGING ERP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES. History has clearly shown that it takes more than the right ERP product to succeed. The State also needs the right team and the right approach. We will bring experienced senior staff to the State that has led successful statewide ERP projects. One of our key differentiators is that we bring both deep implementation and specific knowledge

r 3

of Alaska's business and legacy systems. This unique blend of expertise reduces risk.

System Initialization - This activity coincides with the E-CIM Envision phase and includes confirming requirements, identifying optimal configuration to enable business processes, assigning individual project tasks, coordinating activities, and monitoring and reporting quality and progress. During System Initialization, we will confirm the technical infrastructure and business process strategy, conduct benchmarking, define cost effective solutions for performance and scalability, and recommend the right hardware infrastructure and configuration required to implement and support the new ERP. The agreed upon technical infrastructure will also be prepared during initialization.

System Installation - The activities of analyzing the requirements for rack space, power, air conditioning, connectivity, operating system configuration, and integrating with the State's Tivoli backup system will be coordinated with the project team and the State's ETS division. System installation encompasses the hardware and software environments needed to support BPR, configuration, testing, training, conversion, and production activities across all phases. A comprehensive installation test is performed on all environments prior to release to the project team and the Installation Certification Document is prepared and submitted.

Business Process Design/Reengineering - This full lifecycle activity uses interactive BPR sessions to map current as-is processes to government best practices and our solution capabilities. System configuration options and as-is business processes will be reviewed with stakeholders in each functional area to identify improvement opportunities, and reduce customizations. We will work with the State to meet business requirements using the baseline product and configuration, rather than new code. Our BPR approach includes two key tenets: 1) include all business processes when creating the solution blueprint and planning the deployment; and 2) use our Alaska and public sector experience to assess the impact of potential process changes on policies, statutes, process integrity, and information access.

System Configuration - System configuration activities are performed throughout the project and include configuration training, selecting and implementing configuration options, and delivering comprehensive configuration documentation. System settings and configuration options necessary for each business area (referenced in Sample Configuration Plan) are also included. A baseline configuration environment will be established and maintained with current system configuration settings. This environment will be updated and maintained by authorized staff throughout the project and will serve as the "gold standard" for updating other environments as needed.

System Tailoring – We will use a four-pronged approach to tailor our solution: 1) provide an out-of-the-box COTS solution meeting at least 88% of the State's requirements based on our preliminary assessment, 2) provide a comprehensive set of configuration capabilities to implement existing processes and facilitate future upgrades, 3) leverage BPR to realign state business processes with government best practices embedded within our ERP, and 4) wherever possible, incorporate the State's software customizations into our baseline COTS product to reduce the cost of maintenance and future upgrades. During pre-award, we will work with the State's SMEs to understand the intent for requirements marked as "not met" in Exhibit F. As with our other implementations, we are confident that with this interaction, along with our proposed value added services, we can achieve a 100% fit.

Interface Design and Development – During pre-award, we will confirm our understanding of the existing interfaces, data they exchange, and their operating patterns. We will develop a set of interface specifications based on our past experience with the AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA, and other legacy systems. We will produce an interface map detailing how and when each interface is transitioned to the ERP, which interfaces are retired, the number of interfaces to be created, and any temporary interfaces to be used during the phased implementation (e.g. AKPAY to ERP for personal services information). We will use our standard data integration tool to develop the system interfaces based on the approved interface specifications. We will test and validate the operation of the interfaces against the ERP, and 3rd party interfaces which can be problematic, and coordinate the transition of the interfaces from legacy systems to the new ERP.

Data Conversion – We have extensive experience with the data models and structures of the AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA and supporting legacy systems. We will develop a Conversion Plan that maps the data between the legacy data sources and the new ERP. These maps define transformation (including data typing) and validation rules to be applied during the conversion process. Sample conversion runs are performed to verify the process and rules, and identify data quality issues. The conversion process will target current and prior year information from AKSAS, and current information from AKPAY and WPA.

Historical data will remain in ALDER. Once in production, the ERP will feed data to ALDER.
Testing - We will develop a comprehensive Test Plan outlining the approach, testing activities, data requirements, and test reporting activities. We will leverage a repository of existing public sector and scenario-based scripts, and develop new scripts, all traced back to baseline requirements. Scripts will cover system, integration, performance, and acceptance testing. We will use production-level data to validate the business functionality and system performance capabilities of the technical environment. Our testing tools will provide visibility related to progress and results. We will work with the State to define a clear set of Go/No Go criteria for system acceptance.
Post-implementation Stabilization - This activity starts with developing the Go Live and Stabilization Plan. This plan includes mutually agreed upon criteria for moving into production, a readiness checklist, and tasks and resource assignments for Go Live. The Go Live Plan also includes a data load plan for conversion. A rollback contingency plan will be developed in the unlikely event that significant problems occur following cutover. In addition to the configured and tested software solution, we will provide in-depth functional and technical training and knowledge transfer, comprehensive training materials, ERP documentation, and transition support to the ETS team. Our transition team will provide initial maintenance and stabilization services as each phase is implemented, and will remain on-site until each phase is complete.
3. TRANSITION FROM EXISTING TO PROPOSED SYSTEMS. We will execute system transition tasks within each project phase and across the entire project lifecycle based on a comprehensive Transition Plan coordinated with the State's business and technical staff. A key differentiator of our approach is "just-in-time" software licensing and installation. Licenses for operating systems, databases, and ERP modules are obtained and used as needed, and no earlier, resulting in significant acquisition and maintenance cost savings. The Transition Plan describes steps required to transition from legacy systems to the new ERP, including software, infrastructure, data, staff readiness, and staff functional and technical training. The team will conduct mock conversions to verify readiness, and confirm data quality. Our plan is based on realistic implementation dates, including fiscal year end, annual close, and other key dates. After Go Live, we will transition solution maintenance and support to the State's Help Desk.
4. EDUCATE AND TRAIN STATE EMPLOYEES ON THE PROPOSED SYSTEMS. We use a holistic approach to education and training, knowledge transfer, and skill development by addressing the needs of end users, systems and technical staff, senior management, and other stakeholders. We will develop a comprehensive Training Plan defining the training curriculum, training materials, delivery methods, instructors and attendees, schedule, and tools. Our approach will incorporate the State's unique geographic challenges, staff and facility availability, and scheduling constraints. Education and training for key functional and technical staff will begin in the pre-award phase and continue throughout the project, expanding to end user groups prior to Go Live. We will use a train-the-trainer approach with a combination of formal classroom training in Juneau and other state training facilities, distance learning, and computer-based training. We will also provide a complete set of functional and technical training materials and Quick Reference Guides tailored to the State of Alaska implementation.
5. MONITOR PERFORMANCE THROUGHOUT THE CONTRACT TERM. A key to managing large complex projects is selecting the right attributes to measure and monitor. Those activities controlling critical path, or containing significant risk or complex dependencies, must be monitored and measured. Performance measures will be focused on the actual product and solution, not the work by-products created during the project. Installing the solution, completing configuration, and completing data conversion are examples of key project milestones against which performance can readily be measured. Our E-CIM methodology leverages PMBOK-based principles and includes proactive processes, reusable templates, and dashboard tools to monitor performance, and provide exception-based reporting and visibility to internal and external stakeholders. We will establish mutually agreed upon key performance indicators with the State at the on-set. We will also conduct project health reporting using specific methods, tools, and quantifiable measures (e.g., cost and schedule variance reporting) to clearly indicate status, and manage change, risks, and issues. Project status will always be visible to the State, and monitored by our corporate Project Management Office through a mandatory monthly client engagement health check process. A Weekly Risk Report (WRR) will be prepared and if any project health issues arise, corrective actions will be implemented. Corrective measures may include additional reporting and monitoring, and/or additional executive oversight of the engagement. This process has produced a perfect ERP implementation track record – truly the lowest risk delivery method.

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk 1: Critical – The product selected as the foundation is not specifically suited for use in the public sector. This leads to compromising functional requirements and excessive customizations diluting the value of the ERP and leading to increased risk for schedule slippage and cost overruns. In a Southern California school district, after a delayed rollout and cost overruns, the district concluded, "It can't be fixed. They need to change the system, dump…and come up with a system that deals with [public sector] payroll only."
Mitigation: Right product. Implement a solution that has been successfully implemented in over 190 states, state departments, municipalities, and other government organizations. Our product's native alignment to Alaska's requirements results in an 88% out-of-the-box fit. With our proposed value added services and BPR, we can achieve a 100% fit.

Risk 2: Critical – The vendor team lacks implementation knowledge and specifics on Alaska systems. Inexperienced staff underestimates complexities, and fails to understand the scope and breadth of critical system interfaces, resulting in poor project scheduling, resourcing and staffing estimates. In August 2010, a California Bay Area county was forced to "rip and replace" its ailing ERP system which after four years of implementation met only 50% of the functionality required. The county complaint stated the vendor used the project as a "trial and error" training ground for inexperienced staff.
Mitigation: Right Team. Our project team only implements our ERP product; each of our key project team members has successfully implemented our product in multiple states. Collectively, our team brings over 75+ years of field experience successfully implementing our product. Specifically, our project manager has implemented our product in 6 states. Our business/functional lead has also implemented our product in multiple states. Our DW/Reporting lead has extensive experience with other State of Alaska Departments the specific systems (AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA) that the new ERP is replacing, and Alaska's data warehouse and reporting solution (ALDER). Our project team, senior management, and system staff (which build and maintain our ERP product) bring Alaska a highly seasoned, proven team with a deep understanding of public sector ERP systems and direct Alaska experience.

Risk 3: Critical – Vendors without a standard methodology adapted specifically to the unique needs of Alaska will be unable to create and execute a realistic and achievable plan. The multi-phased implementation of an ERP is a complex undertaking requiring a comprehensive, proven approach to completing the project. This risk will result in key activities being omitted, an underestimate of the level of effort, and unrealistic time commitments for key State staff. The lack of a standard methodology tailored specifically to the needs of the State of Alaska will jeopardize project value, increase costs, and introduce unnecessary risk.
Mitigation: Right Methodology/Approach. Our estimates are based on factual historical metrics collected from over 190 implementations of our product in the state and local government space. For Alaska, we have crafted a comprehensive approach based on our in-depth understanding of the State's business environment, staff, and legacy systems. We validated our Alaska plan for completeness and accuracy against these historical metrics. We recognize that the implementation process is not a sprint and must make efficient use of resources over a period of years not weeks. Knowing state resources must continue supporting the business, legacy systems, and other time sensitive requests (e.g., implementing fund categories to meet GASB reporting requirements), our approach targets participation of state resources in a focused and balanced manner. This is the right approach to reduce the risk of schedule delays caused by unrealistic or uninformed expectations of state resource time and participation levels.

Risk 4: Critical – Attempting to integrate an ERP's standard reporting tool alongside or in place of ALDER increases implementation risk, reduces user efficiency, limits enterprise data access, increases maintenance and operations costs, and potentially jeopardize business continuity. As stated in the RFP, the new solution must be integrated with ALDER to support historical and current transactional reporting. ALDER is a complex and powerful reporting tool and integration is complex.
Mitigation: Right use of ALDER by integrating to the ERP solution. Instead of relegating ALDER to a historical only repository or replacing it, our solution is to utilize ALDER as **the** reporting tool for ERP. This fully leverages Alaska's investment and takes advantage of ALDER's widespread adoption. Data

from our ERP solution will be loaded into the ALDER database and historical and current financial transaction reporting is done through ALDER's Business Objects front end. This will provide a statewide view of financial, procurement, and human resources data. As a result, Alaska staff will require minimal training on the new reports, and have broader access to strategic ERP data. Our approach to ALDER as the reporting solution reduces license, maintenance and operating costs, while also reducing implementation risk and increasing user satisfaction and adoption of the new ERP system.

Risk 5: Severe – Not staffing for a multi-year project the size and complexity of Alaska ERP (which is more critical than for small, short duration, narrowly focused projects). Large, complex ERP projects require staff committed to the entire project lifecycle to avoid the risks associated with staff turnover – particularly of key senior staff. This turnover impacts timely and efficient decision making, compromises team collaboration, and impacts project schedule.
Mitigation: Right Staff Plan. We understand firsthand the unique challenges and costs of staffing a long-term project in Alaska with SMEs from other parts of the U.S. Climate, culture, and distance combine to create a unique set of project challenges in Alaska. We are committing one of our most seasoned, experienced, and dedicated project managers who has started and successfully finished all six of the previous ERP projects she has managed. Additionally our project manager will relocate to Juneau for the duration of the project to maximize time on-site, and to support effective collaboration with Alaska. Our functional/technical SMEs will work onsite for efficient collaboration and direct interaction with state staff. When appropriate, they will work remotely to minimize travel costs. We have successfully applied this same distributed project team structure on other complex Alaska projects. Additionally, we have added a top ranked local Alaska IT partner with state systems experience and resources on the ground in Juneau to augment our data conversion activities and local on-site presence.

Risk 6: Severe – The tight linkage between AKSAS and AKPAY raises the risk of failure when an existing linkage is replaced in Phase 1 with the new ERP financial module. As described in the 2006 Business Case, a natural disaster (or system failure) impacting AKSAS or AKPAY during the implementation of the ERP could significantly impact the project schedule, and potentially result in the state incurring significant costs due to the outage (e.g. Penalty Pay).
Mitigation: Right Specific Disaster Protection Planning. Having worked with many state clients with similar legacy systems, we have the expertise to assess potential failure points for uncommon natural disasters, and more common infrastructure, system, and configuration failures. In the pre-award planning phase, we will conduct a risk assessment of the AKSAS and AKPAY environments to identify potential failure points, then identify and implement risk mitigation strategies to guard against this risk.

Risk 7: Severe – The ERP is designed to serve a broad market audience. Products designed to support manufacturing, retail, and other commercial environments must consider the needs of all these industries when planning future enhancements. Alaska would compete for the limited R&D resources to maintain, sustain, and enhance the product, and be forced to develop workarounds to meet legislative mandates and federal directives.
Mitigation: Right Future. Every dollar we spend on R&D is focused on government best practices and requirements. Alaska will be nominated to our User Steering Committee, and will have a much stronger voice in defining the future direction of new ERP releases. Alaska benefits when enhancements to the baseline ERP are provided to all clients (e.g. to meet federal directives), and has the option to implement customizations into the Alaska codebase to accommodate state specific requirements.

Risk 8: Severe – Not having one primary responsible party. Solutions involving independent solution integrators and separate ERP software providers introduce multiple points of responsibility, clouding the resolution of issues encountered during implementation.
Mitigation: Right Combination. Our solution provides Alaska a single point of accountability for the project. Having this single point of accountability is a major factor in contributing to our 100% success rate of implementing government ERP solutions. The best mitigation is for the vendor to be the product owner/developer, product implementer, and maintenance provider with the expertise, knowledge, and resources. This eliminates delays in communications, accessing baseline code changes, resolving technical issues, and obtaining support that often arise between separate organizations.

Risk 9: Severe – A vendor approach that treats the implementation as three separate projects, each focusing on only one business area at a time. In a complex, multi-phase project, failing to clearly define the entire solution early may cause significant rework in later phases, and ultimately project failure.
Mitigation: Right Processes. Early in the project (Envision), we will create a comprehensive blueprint for the entire solution, encompassing all verified requirements, business processes, and systems affected. The blueprint provides a holistic view of the entire ERP solution, including the interface of legacy systems with the new ERP, and is used to verify that scope and objectives are met during each stage of the project. For example, the ASSET project's TimeLink system requires custom interfaces with AKSAS and AKPAY. The blueprint helps the State understand how those custom ASSET interfaces are impacted when AKSAS and AKPAY are replaced, and how we plan work to avoid major changes and disruptions later. Similarly, the blueprint helps Alaska identify other legacy systems and processes which may be affected, but to date may not have been contemplated.

Risk 10: Severe-The criticality of the tight link between AKSAS and AKPAY is not understood by the vendor. AKPAY passes personal service cost information to AKSAS. This information must continue to be exchanged during the time between retirement of AKSAS and retirement of AKPAY. Without this interface, personnel expenditure costs will not available for reporting from ERP or ALDER.
Mitigation: Right Continuity. A current and working knowledge of the legacy systems will minimize this risk when used as input to the blueprint and interface design. As part of preparing our response, we assessed the effort for existing interfaces between AKPAY and AKSAS (e.g. labor distribution); AKPAY and ALDER (e.g. employee and position transactions); AKSAS and ALDER (e.g. structure, financial, reference transactions); AKSAS, AKPAY, and ASSET (labor, hours and leave); and the HR Indicative file while including them in our approach and plan.

Risk 11: Moderate – Software License Model constrains future growth and increases cost. The true total cost of ownership can be underestimated if the State has to undergo future "re-sizing" adjustments, audits from the software vendor, or expensive upgrades.
Mitigation: Right Licensing Model. We will issue the State an enterprise license for our ERP product with no restriction on the number of users or environments to be implemented. When the need arises to expand the usage of the ERP solution, Alaska will not have any additional base ERP product license costs.

Risk 12: Moderate – Unrealistic and excessive demands for State staff during implementation and post-implementation causes delays, impacts to solution quality, and impacts to support levels. Vendors not familiar with the resource challenges present in state government often create project work plans based on faulty assumptions about the availability and capability of resources, assuming the State is able to divert key senior resources from their normal duties for extended periods of time. Additionally, these same vendors often create schedules with multiple large deliverables scheduled to be delivered at the same time or during peak work time, and with unrealistically short turn-around timeframes for approval.
Mitigation: Right Work Plan. Key state resources are highly leveraged on a day to day basis, and likely may have to perform their current job and support the project. Our approach will use their time in a targeted manner to review work products and desired process changes, and make decisions. To optimize their time, we will bring solutions rather than asking for lengthy explanations, and conduct walkthroughs with Alaska staff to make the review more efficient. Our existing, intimate knowledge of Alaska legacy systems and IT infrastructure will gives us the ability to work independently with reduced guidance or training from State staff. In addition, our structured mentor training program will prepare the AKPAY and AKSAS maintenance and operations resources (Analyst Programmers, System Programmers, Database Specialists, Data Processing Managers, etc.) to transition to the new ERP solution with minimal impact to their time. Our approach gradually transitions responsibility for maintenance and operations as each person gains sufficient proficiency. Since we provide hosting and support for our ERP, our team is also available as needed to augment state support staff further minimizing risks.

EXHIBIT D4: IMPLEMENTATION ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Complete the table below by estimating both the State's and Offeror's labor effort for each required deliverable described in Section 5.04 of the RFP. This information will clarify the expected roles, responsibilities and time required for implementing the proposed solution and help the State more accurately evaluate the Offeror's proposal.

Deliverable	Estimated State labor effort (hours)	Proposed Offeror labor effort (hours)
1. Baseline detailed project work plan	736	828
2. Project status reports	2,106	2,121
3. Weekly risk reports	1,352	1,840
4. Satisfaction surveys	312	312
5. System configuration reports	11,924	16,094
6. Business process modification recommendations	1,960	2,960
7. Configured software ready for test	17,220	32,845
8. Accepted workflows	11,730	9,530
9. Hardware specification (applicable to licensed solution)	2,415	2,614
10. Application architecture documentation	3,404	5,940
11. Installation certification document	1,500	2,760
12. Data conversion plan	1,630	2,140
13. Validated migrated data	1,620	3,120
14. Reports	4,820	9,030
15. Interface specifications	1,835	2,680
16. Tested interfaces	5,600	10,340
17. Test plan	2,420	3,420
18. Volume/stress testing report	1,680	2,300
19. Training plan	330	630
20. Training materials	2,910	4,770
21. Training	4,660	3,030
22. Knowledge transfer plan and activity	2,560	2,976
23. Go-live and stabilization plan	1,240	1,800
24. Technical operations manual	490	950
25. Business user manual	830	1670
26. Configured and licensed software in productive use	2,900	3,590
27. Stabilization services	7,135	11,127
	97,319	141,417

CGI

PROJECT WORK PLAN

1. METHODOLOGY FOR MANAGING PROJECT SCOPE, SCHEDULE, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT: We know that the State of Alaska (the State), while similar in many dimensions to other states, has a unique combination of systems, business processes, requirements, culture, and geography. We have a unique understanding of these specific elements and proven expertise in managing, implementing, transitioning, training, and maintaining ERP solutions specifically for governments. We will use our ERP COTS Implementation Methodology (E-CIM) to manage this project. E-CIM combines industry best practices for project management (e.g., PMBOK, IEEE, CMMI, ISO) with a structured, four-phase implementation model derived from breakthrough performance concepts. The four phases are Envision, Create, Achieve, and Support. E-CIM spans the full project lifecycle, and includes processes, templates, and tools for managing scope, schedule, budget, and daily implementation activities. We will tailor E-CIM specifically for the State using knowledge gained from our past projects with multiple, major Alaska departments. This section provides a high-level summary of our approach.

Managing Scope – Developing a perfect project plan at the outset, and expecting that plan to remain static is unrealistic for a project with this level of complexity. Changes will arise that must be accommodated and addressed for a successful outcome. Consistent requirements traceability is critical, and a foundation of our E-CIM methodology. During the E-CIM Envision phase, we will collaborate with the State to confirm requirements, and use our collective knowledge of the state legacy systems and processes to produce a clear project plan and solution blueprint. This blueprint provides a comprehensive picture of the entire ERP solution (including baseline requirements, interfaces, data sources, configuration decisions, and hardware infrastructure) very early in the project. Developing this comprehensive picture early is the only way to effectively manage the project, and minimize the implications of scope changes that often materialize months later. E-CIM is highly flexible and built to accommodate new, time-sensitive requirements often introduced by external forces ([redacted]). We address these inevitable changes in a disciplined, methodical fashion. During the pre-award phase, we will clearly document our mutual understanding of scope. During the post-award implementation phase, our scope management processes will be used to analyze, document, and implement any agreed changes.

Managing Schedule – We will manage and control the comprehensive work plan, including State activities and ours. The project Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and schedule will be refined and validated during the pre-award phase, and will be the vehicle for our schedule management activities. The work plan defines schedule, responsibility, and accountability at the individual team member level, and is sufficiently granular to manage tasks and resources without being cumbersome to create and maintain. The work plan encompasses all aspects of the project, and breaks the work into discrete phases, groupings, and tasks. Day-to-day project activities and dependencies between and within the phases will be clearly identified. We will baseline the schedule at the end of pre-award, and start tracking actual versus estimated effort. We report progress at the individual task level with team leads, group leads, and senior project management verifying the results. The work plan will be visible to all staff, and a dashboard will be provided to senior management and the project steering committee for project visibility.

Managing Implementation - The State needs a vendor that emphasizes project management, organizes tasks based on proven experience, assigns work to the right staff, manages the work activities, and provides adequate visibility and reporting to the State's Project Steering Committee. Our governance structure will define roles and responsibilities, decision rights, performance measures, and escalation procedures consistent with Attachment L (L-3). Our iterative, waterfall approach has regular checkpoints to assess quality, and address issues and risks. Our management team will remove obstacles, and confirm that team members have access to the resources, information, and material needed to complete their work. Project management will also coordinate with external project stakeholders, monitor progress and quality, report status to the Steering Committee, and facilitate issue resolution. Members will perform work in accordance with the schedule and identify issues and risks as appropriate. Group and team leads will monitor performance, conduct quality reviews, and verify completed tasks. Our Go/No-Go readiness assessment determines when to proceed with cutover activities.

2. APPROACH FOR MANAGING ERP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES. History has clearly shown that it takes more than the right ERP product to succeed. The State also needs the right team and the right approach. We will bring experienced senior staff to the State that has led successful statewide ERP projects. One of our key differentiators is that we bring <u>both</u> deep implementation and specific knowledge

DS

of Alaska's business and legacy systems. This unique blend of expertise reduces risk.

System Initialization - This activity coincides with the E-CIM Envision phase and includes confirming requirements, identifying optimal configuration to enable business processes, assigning individual project tasks, coordinating activities, and monitoring and reporting quality and progress. During System Initialization, we will confirm the technical infrastructure and business process strategy, conduct benchmarking, define cost effective solutions for performance and scalability, and recommend the right hardware infrastructure and configuration required to implement and support the new ERP. The agreed upon technical infrastructure will also be prepared during initialization.

System Installation - The activities of analyzing the requirements for rack space, power, air conditioning, connectivity, operating system configuration, and integrating with the State's Tivoli backup system will be coordinated with the project team and the State's ETS division. System installation encompasses the hardware and software environments needed to support BPR, configuration, testing, training, conversion, and production activities across all phases. A comprehensive installation test is performed on all environments prior to release to the project team and the Installation Certification Document is prepared and submitted.

Business Process Design/Reengineering - This full lifecycle activity uses interactive BPR sessions to map current as-is processes to government best practices and our solution capabilities. System configuration options and as-is business processes will be reviewed with stakeholders in each functional area to identify improvement opportunities, and reduce customizations. We will work with the State to meet business requirements using the baseline product and configuration, rather than new code. Our BPR approach includes two key tenets: 1) include all business processes when creating the solution blueprint and planning the deployment; and 2) use our Alaska and public sector experience to assess the impact of potential process changes on policies, statutes, process integrity, and information access.

System Configuration - System configuration activities are performed throughout the project and include configuration training, selecting and implementing configuration options, and delivering comprehensive configuration documentation. System settings and configuration options necessary for each business area (referenced in Sample Configuration Plan) are also included. A baseline configuration environment will be established and maintained with current system configuration settings. This environment will be updated and maintained by authorized staff throughout the project and will serve as the "gold standard" for updating other environments as needed.

System Tailoring – We will use a four-pronged approach to tailor our solution: 1) provide an out-of-the-box COTS solution meeting at least 88% of the State's requirements based on our preliminary assessment, 2) provide a comprehensive set of configuration capabilities to implement existing processes and facilitate future upgrades, 3) leverage BPR to realign state business processes with government best practices embedded within our ERP, and 4) wherever possible, incorporate the State's software customizations into our baseline COTS product to reduce the cost of maintenance and future upgrades. During pre-award, we will work with the State's SMEs to understand the intent for requirements marked as "not met" in Exhibit F. As with our other implementations, we are confident that with this interaction, along with our proposed value added services, we can achieve a 100% fit.

Interface Design and Development – During pre-award, we will confirm our understanding of the existing interfaces, data they exchange, and their operating patterns. We will develop a set of interface specifications based on our past experience with the AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA, and other legacy systems. We will produce an interface map detailing how and when each interface is transitioned to the ERP, which interfaces are retired, the number of interfaces to be created, and any temporary interfaces to be used during the phased implementation (e.g. AKPAY to ERP for personal services information). We will use our standard data integration tool to develop the system interfaces based on the approved interface specifications. We will test and validate the operation of the interfaces against the ERP, and 3rd party interfaces which can be problematic, and coordinate the transition of the interfaces from legacy systems to the new ERP.

Data Conversion – We have extensive experience with the data models and structures of the AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA and supporting legacy systems. We will develop a Conversion Plan that maps the data between the legacy data sources and the new ERP. These maps define transformation (including data typing) and validation rules to be applied during the conversion process. Sample conversion runs are performed to verify the process and rules, and identify data quality issues. The conversion process will target current and prior year information from AKSAS, and current information from AKPAY and WPA.

RAVA PLAN

EXHIBIT C2: RISK ASSESSMENT

List and prioritize major risk items that are unique to this project, as well as your proposed mitigation strategies. This includes areas that may cause the service to not be completed within budget, schedule, or in accordance with the scope of work and conditions described in the RFP. The risks may include both internal and external factors. The risks should be non-technical, but should also contain enough information to describe to an evaluator why the risk is valid. Explain, also in non-technical terms, how best to mitigate or avoid the risks, highlighting your unique methods or approaches.

The risk assessment plan must include the risks and mitigation for both the Software Product and System Implementer Offerors in the same response form.

Please note that your Risk Assessment cannot exceed three pages (excluding these instructions).

from our ERP solution will be loaded into the ALDER database and historical and current financial transaction reporting is done through ALDER's Business Objects front end. This will provide a statewide view of financial, procurement, and human resources data. As a result, Alaska staff will require minimal training on the new reports, and have broader access to strategic ERP data. Our approach to ALDER as the reporting solution reduces license, maintenance and operating costs, while also reducing implementation risk and increasing user satisfaction and adoption of the new ERP system.

Risk 5: Severe – Not staffing for a multi-year project the size and complexity of Alaska ERP (which is more critical than for small, short duration, narrowly focused projects). Large, complex ERP projects require staff committed to the entire project lifecycle to avoid the risks associated with staff turnover – particularly of key senior staff. This turnover impacts timely and efficient decision making, compromises team collaboration, and impacts project schedule.
Mitigation: Right Staff Plan. We understand firsthand the unique challenges and costs of staffing a long-term project in Alaska with SMEs from other parts of the U.S. Climate, culture, and distance combine to create a unique set of project challenges in Alaska. We are committing one of our most seasoned, experienced, and dedicated project managers who has started and successfully finished all six of the previous ERP projects she has managed. Additionally our project manager will relocate to Juneau for the duration of the project to maximize time on-site, and to support effective collaboration with Alaska. Our functional/technical SMEs will work onsite for efficient collaboration and direct interaction with state staff. When appropriate, they will work remotely to minimize travel costs. We have successfully applied this same distributed project team structure on other complex Alaska projects. Additionally, we have added a top ranked local Alaska IT partner with state systems experience and resources on the ground in Juneau to augment our data conversion activities and local on-site presence.

Risk 6: Severe – The tight linkage between AKSAS and AKPAY raises the risk of failure when an existing linkage is replaced in Phase 1 with the new ERP financial module. As described in the 2006 Business Case, a natural disaster (or system failure) impacting AKSAS or AKPAY during the implementation of the ERP could significantly impact the project schedule, and potentially result in the state incurring significant costs due to the outage (e.g. Penalty Pay).
Mitigation: Right Specific Disaster Protection Planning. Having worked with many state clients with similar legacy systems, we have the expertise to assess potential failure points for uncommon natural disasters, and more common infrastructure, system, and configuration failures. In the pre-award planning phase, we will conduct a risk assessment of the AKSAS and AKPAY environments to identify potential failure points, then identify and implement risk mitigation strategies to guard against this risk.

Headline doesn't match text!

Risk 7: Severe – The ERP is designed to serve a broad market audience. Products designed to support manufacturing, retail, and other commercial environments must consider the needs of all these industries when planning future enhancements. Alaska would compete for the limited R&D resources to maintain, sustain, and enhance the product, and be forced to develop workarounds to meet legislative mandates and federal directives.
Mitigation: Right Future. Every dollar we spend on R&D is focused on government best practices and requirements. Alaska will be nominated to our User Steering Committee, and will have a much stronger voice in defining the future direction of new ERP releases. Alaska benefits when enhancements to the baseline ERP are provided to all clients (e.g. to meet federal directives), and has the option to implement customizations into the Alaska codebase to accommodate state specific requirements.

Risk 8: Severe – Not having one primary responsible party. Solutions involving independent solution integrators and separate ERP software providers introduce multiple points of responsibility, clouding the resolution of issues encountered during implementation.
Mitigation: Right Combination. Our solution provides Alaska a single point of accountability for the project. Having this single point of accountability is a major factor in contributing to our 100% success rate of implementing government ERP solutions. The best mitigation is for the vendor to be the product owner/developer, product implementer, and maintenance provider with the expertise, knowledge, and resources. This eliminates delays in communications, accessing baseline code changes, resolving technical issues, and obtaining support that often arise between separate organizations.

DS

VALUE ADDED

Item 1: Treasury Reciprocity Program (TRP) and Funding Potential
The TRP allows states to match vendor payments nationwide against Alaska debts. Vendor payments are offset and the funds are routed to Alaska for repayment. Three states, MD, NJ, and NY have collected over $69M in payments. A present client with similar size and budget estimates over $10M in debt collected from vendor payments. For Alaska, this includes the interface to submit and receive debt information with the U.S. Treasury, and to process offset payments in the ERP system. Alaska will realize payments in excess of $3M annually, and will have a pay back of less than one year. During the pre-award phase, a benefit funding approach will be discussed to support the implementation of this item.
Cost: $2,363,301

?

Item 2: Managed Services of the ERP Solution (Operations and Enhanced Maintenance).
This provides Alaska with a singular responsible contact for daily operation, issue resolution, version upgrades, Alaska specific configuration, and underlying 3rd-party software. Under an SLA, we proactively conduct performance tuning, capacity management and planning, identify future infrastructure needs as part of state planning cycles, and provide 24/7 production monitoring of the ERP system. We also provide management services for interfaces between the ERP and ALDER, ASSET, and ABS, and provide a 24/7 2nd level helpdesk. This service also provides Alaska with support for the State's disaster recovery system and three non-production systems (e.g. testing system). The benefits to Alaska include a singular point of contact and accountability for the entire ERP solution, enhanced business continuity, and 25% lower cost of ownership as a result of amortizing costs and deferring upfront expenditures. With this model, the application remains hosted within the State's data center with the State retaining control of the infrastructure and physical hardware. Collectively, this services model provides higher application stability, minimizes disruption of normal operations, and provides a level of services and support that is consistent with the critical needs of an ERP at a value-oriented price point.
Cost: Year 1 = $1,858,170 and thereafter Years 2-9 = $1,651,474 (Based on a 10-year term to be paid in annual installments at the beginning of each year).

is it even an option?

Item 3: Enhanced "Strategic Fit" Customizations
We have identified 27 targeted customizations to our baseline ERP product, covering 84 requirements, that if implemented increase our out-of-the-box fit with Alaska requirements from 88% to 91%. These customizations will include asset management, overpayments, and leave, and will optimize the alignment and fit of our financial and payroll modules to the business needs required by Alaska.
Cost: $2,488,231

why not in Base proposal?

Item 4: Advanced Performance Budgeting (APB)
The retirement of the Alaska Budget System (ABS) should be considered as part of the implementation of the ERP solution. We can replace ABS with our APB solution, providing Alaska with the functionality required for comprehensive budget planning and analysis that is fully integrated with the ERP solution. APB will also provide broader budget management capabilities than currently available with ABS. Alaska gains the value of fully integrated budget planning and forecasting within the ERP, and eliminates the interface between ABS and the AKSAS and AKPAY systems, and the interfaces between ABS and the new ERP solution. This provides the legislative budget planning process with real time analysis capabilities of budgeted positions, and actual personnel costs. It provides up to date forecasting and analysis of currently encumbered and expended amounts, and the ability to easily perform "what-if" budget creation and analysis during the time-critical May through Sept re-appropriation period. The State will be able to easily analyze position vacancy rates, turnover, retirement projections, and the resulting impact to the personal services budgets. Forty-six of our clients have earned the "Distinguished Budget Presentation Award" from the Government Finance Officers Association using our APB budgeting capabilities.
Cost: $4,648,172 (This includes implementation services, license, and 10-year maintenance.)

oversold

?

Item 5: Grant Life Cycle Management (GLM) System
Each year Alaska departments receive and independently manage millions in grant funding. The lifecycle of a grant frequently spans multiple fiscal years and requires significant effort to track and administer successfully. Section 1512 of the American Recovery Reinvestment Act (ARRA 2009), instituted additional reporting requirements for federally funded grants that add to the overall burden. The GLM module provides Alaska with grant management capabilities ranging from identification and application, through award, execution, and closing phases. It also provides complete tracking and reporting of

DS

EXHIBIT D4: IMPLEMENTATION ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Complete the table below by estimating both the State's and Offeror's labor effort for each required deliverable described in Section 5.04 of the RFP. This information will clarify the expected roles, responsibilities and time required for implementing the proposed solution and help the State more accurately evaluate the Offeror's proposal.

Deliverable	Estimated State labor effort (hours)	Proposed Offeror labor effort (hours)
1. Baseline detailed project work plan	736	828
2. Project status reports	2,106	2,121
3. Weekly risk reports	1,352	1,840
4. Satisfaction surveys	312	312
5. System configuration reports	11,924	16,094
6. Business process modification recommendations	1,960	2,960
7. Configured software ready for test	17,220	32,845
8. Accepted workflows	11,730	9,530
9. Hardware specification (applicable to licensed solution)	2,415	2,614
10. Application architecture documentation	3,404	5,940
11. Installation certification document	1,500	2,760
12. Data conversion plan	1,630	2,140
13. Validated migrated data	1,620	3,120
14. Reports	4,820	9,030
15. Interface specifications	1,835	2,680
16. Tested interfaces	5,600	10,340
17. Test plan	2,420	3,420
18. Volume/stress testing report	1,680	2,300
19. Training plan	330	630
20. Training materials	2,910	4,770
21. Training	4,660	3,030
22. Knowledge transfer plan and activity	2,560	2,976
23. Go-live and stabilization plan	1,240	1,800
24. Technical operations manual	490	950
25. Business user manual	830	1670
26. Configured and licensed software in productive use	2,900	3,590
27. Stabilization services	7,135	11,127
	97,319	141,417

238.7

DS

PROJECT WORK PLAN

1. METHODOLOGY FOR MANAGING PROJECT SCOPE, SCHEDULE, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT: We know that the State of Alaska (the State), while similar in many dimensions to other states, has a unique combination of systems, business processes, requirements, culture, and geography. We have a unique understanding of these specific elements and proven expertise in managing, implementing, transitioning, training, and maintaining ERP solutions specifically for governments. We will use our ERP COTS Implementation Methodology (E-CIM) to manage this project. E-CIM combines industry best practices for project management (e.g., PMBOK, IEEE, CMMI, ISO) with a structured, four-phase implementation model derived from breakthrough performance concepts. The four phases are Envision, Create, Achieve, and Support. E-CIM spans the full project lifecycle, and includes processes, templates, and tools for managing scope, schedule, budget, and daily implementation activities. We will tailor E-CIM specifically for the State using knowledge gained from our past projects with multiple, major Alaska departments. This section provides a high-level summary of our approach.

Managing Scope – Developing a perfect project plan at the outset, and expecting that plan to remain static is unrealistic for a project with this level of complexity. Changes will arise that must be accommodated and addressed for a successful outcome. Consistent requirements traceability is critical, and a foundation of our E-CIM methodology. During the E-CIM Envision phase, we will collaborate with the State to confirm requirements, and use our collective knowledge of the state legacy systems and processes to produce a clear project plan and solution blueprint. This blueprint provides a comprehensive picture of the entire ERP solution (including baseline requirements, interfaces, data sources, configuration decisions, and hardware infrastructure) very early in the project. Developing this comprehensive picture early is the only way to effectively manage the project, and minimize the implications of scope changes that often materialize months later. E-CIM is highly flexible and built to accommodate new, time-sensitive requirements often introduced by external forces ([redacted]). We address these inevitable changes in a disciplined, methodical fashion. During the pre-award phase, we will clearly document our mutual understanding of scope. During the post-award implementation phase, our scope management processes will be used to analyze, document, and implement any agreed changes.

Managing Schedule – ~~We will manage and control the comprehensive work plan, including State activities and ours.~~ The project Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and schedule will be refined and validated during the pre-award phase, and will be the vehicle for our schedule management activities. The work plan defines schedule, responsibility, and accountability at the individual team member level, and is sufficiently granular to manage tasks and resources without being cumbersome to create and maintain. The work plan encompasses all aspects of the project, and breaks the work into discrete phases, groupings, and tasks. Day-to-day project activities and dependencies between and within the phases will be clearly identified. We will baseline the schedule at the end of pre-award, and start tracking actual versus estimated effort. We report progress at the individual task level with team leads, group leads, and senior project management verifying the results. The work plan will be visible to all staff, and a dashboard will be provided to senior management and the project steering committee for project visibility.

Managing Implementation - The State needs a vendor that emphasizes project management, organizes tasks based on proven experience, assigns work to the right staff, manages the work activities, and provides adequate visibility and reporting to the State's Project Steering Committee. Our governance structure will define roles and responsibilities, decision rights, performance measures, and escalation procedures consistent with Attachment L (L-3). Our iterative, waterfall approach has regular checkpoints to assess quality, and address issues and risks. Our management team will remove obstacles, and confirm that team members have access to the resources, information, and material needed to complete their work. Project management will also coordinate with external project stakeholders, monitor progress and quality, report status to the Steering Committee, and facilitate issue resolution. Members will perform work in accordance with the schedule and identify issues and risks as appropriate. Group and team leads will monitor performance, conduct quality reviews, and verify completed tasks. Our Go/No-Go readiness assessment determines when to proceed with cutover activities.

2. APPROACH FOR MANAGING ERP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES. History has clearly shown that it takes more than the right ERP product to succeed. The State also needs the right team and the right approach. We will bring ~~experienced senior staff to the State that has led successful statewide ERP projects.~~ One of our key differentiators is that ~~we bring both deep implementation and specific knowledge~~

mt

of Alaska's business and legacy systems. This unique blend of expertise reduces risk.

System Initialization - This activity coincides with the E-CIM Envision phase and includes confirming requirements, identifying optimal configuration to enable business processes, assigning individual project tasks, coordinating activities, and monitoring and reporting quality and progress. During System Initialization, we will confirm the technical infrastructure and business process strategy, conduct benchmarking, define cost effective solutions for performance and scalability, and recommend the right hardware infrastructure and configuration required to implement and support the new ERP. The agreed upon technical infrastructure will also be prepared during initialization.

System Installation - The activities of analyzing the requirements for rack space, power, air conditioning, connectivity, operating system configuration, and integrating with the State's Tivoli backup system will be coordinated with the project team and the State's ETS division. System installation encompasses the hardware and software environments needed to support BPR, configuration, testing, training, conversion, and production activities across all phases. A comprehensive installation test is performed on all environments prior to release to the project team and the Installation Certification Document is prepared and submitted.

Business Process Design/Reengineering - This full lifecycle activity uses interactive BPR sessions to map current as-is processes to government best practices and our solution capabilities. System configuration options and as-is business processes will be reviewed with stakeholders in each functional area to identify improvement opportunities, and reduce customizations. (We will work with the State to meet business requirements using the baseline product and configuration, rather than new code.) Our BPR approach includes two key tenets: 1) include all business processes when creating the solution blueprint and planning the deployment; and 2) use our Alaska and public sector experience to assess the impact of potential process changes on policies, statutes, process integrity, and information access.

System Configuration - System configuration activities are performed throughout the project and include configuration training, selecting and implementing configuration options, and delivering comprehensive configuration documentation. System settings and configuration options necessary for each business area (referenced in Sample Configuration Plan) are also included. A baseline configuration environment will be established and maintained with current system configuration settings. This environment will be updated and maintained by authorized staff throughout the project and will serve as the "gold standard" for updating other environments as needed.

System Tailoring – We will use a four-pronged approach to tailor our solution: 1) provide an out-of-the-box COTS solution meeting at least 60% of the State's requirements based on our preliminary assessment, 2) provide a comprehensive set of configuration capabilities to implement existing processes and facilitate future upgrades, 3) leverage BPR to realign state business processes with government best practices embedded within our ERP, and 4) wherever possible, incorporate the State's software customizations into our baseline COTS product to reduce the cost of maintenance and future upgrades. During pre-award, we will work with the State's SMEs to understand the intent for requirements marked as "not met" in Exhibit F. As with our other implementations, we are confident that with this interaction, along with our proposed value added services, we can achieve a 100% fit.

Interface Design and Development – During pre-award, we will confirm our understanding of the existing interfaces, data they exchange, and their operating patterns. We will develop a set of interface specifications based on our past experience with the AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA, and other legacy systems. We will produce an interface map detailing how and when each interface is transitioned to the ERP, which interfaces are retired, the number of interfaces to be created, and any temporary interfaces to be used during the phased implementation (e.g. AKPAY to ERP for personal services information). We will use our standard data integration tool to develop the system interfaces based on the approved interface specifications. We will test and validate the operation of the interfaces against the ERP, and 3rd party interfaces which can be problematic, and coordinate the transition of the interfaces from legacy systems to the new ERP.

Data Conversion – We have extensive experience with the data models and structures of the AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA and supporting legacy systems. We will develop a Conversion Plan that maps the data between the legacy data sources and the new ERP. These maps define transformation (including data typing) and validation rules to be applied during the conversion process. Sample conversion runs are performed to verify the process and rules, and identify data quality issues. The conversion process will target current and prior year information from AKSAS, and current information from AKPAY and WPA.

mtt

Historical data will remain in ALDER. Once in production, the ERP will feed data to ALDER.

Testing - We will develop a comprehensive Test Plan outlining the approach, testing activities, data requirements, and test reporting activities. We will leverage a repository of existing public sector and scenario-based scripts, and develop new scripts, all traced back to baseline requirements. Scripts will cover system, integration, performance, and acceptance testing. We will use production-level data to validate the business functionality and system performance capabilities of the technical environment. Our testing tools will provide visibility related to progress and results. We will work with the State to define a clear set of Go/No Go criteria for system acceptance.

Post-implementation Stabilization - This activity starts with developing the Go Live and Stabilization Plan. This plan includes mutually agreed upon criteria for moving into production, a readiness checklist, and tasks and resource assignments for Go Live. The Go Live Plan also includes a data load plan for conversion. A rollback contingency plan will be developed in the unlikely event that significant problems occur following cutover. In addition to the configured and tested software solution, we will provide in-depth functional and technical training and knowledge transfer, comprehensive training materials, ERP documentation, and transition support to the ETS team. Our transition team will provide initial maintenance and stabilization services as each phase is implemented, and will remain on-site until each phase is complete.

3. TRANSITION FROM EXISTING TO PROPOSED SYSTEMS. We will execute system transition tasks within each project phase and across the entire project lifecycle based on a comprehensive Transition Plan coordinated with the State's business and technical staff. A key differentiator of our approach is "just-in-time" software licensing and installation. Licenses for operating systems, databases, and ERP modules are obtained and used as needed, and no earlier, resulting in significant acquisition and maintenance cost savings. The Transition Plan describes steps required to transition from legacy systems to the new ERP, including software, infrastructure, data, staff readiness, and staff functional and technical training. The team will conduct mock conversions to verify readiness, and confirm data quality. Our plan is based on realistic implementation dates, including fiscal year end, annual close, and other key dates. After Go Live, we will transition solution maintenance and support to the State's Help Desk.

4. EDUCATE AND TRAIN STATE EMPLOYEES ON THE PROPOSED SYSTEMS. We use a holistic approach to education and training, knowledge transfer, and skill development by addressing the needs of end users, systems and technical staff, senior management, and other stakeholders. We will develop a comprehensive Training Plan defining the training curriculum, training materials, delivery methods, instructors and attendees, schedule, and tools. Our approach will incorporate the State's unique geographic challenges, staff and facility availability, and scheduling constraints. Education and training for key functional and technical staff will begin in the pre-award phase and continue throughout the project, expanding to end user groups prior to Go Live. We will use a train-the-trainer approach with a combination of formal classroom training in Juneau and other state training facilities, distance learning, and computer-based training. We will also provide a complete set of functional and technical training materials and Quick Reference Guides tailored to the State of Alaska implementation.

5. MONITOR PERFORMANCE THROUGHOUT THE CONTRACT TERM. A key to managing large complex projects is selecting the right attributes to measure and monitor. Those activities controlling critical path, or containing significant risk or complex dependencies, must be monitored and measured. Performance measures will be focused on the actual product and solution, not the work by-products created during the project. Installing the solution, completing configuration, and completing data conversion are examples of key project milestones against which performance can readily be measured. Our E-CIM methodology leverages PMBOK-based principles and includes proactive processes, reusable templates, and dashboard tools to monitor performance, and provide exception-based reporting and visibility to internal and external stakeholders. We will establish mutually agreed upon key performance indicators with the State at the on-set. We will also conduct project health reporting using specific methods, tools, and quantifiable measures (e.g., cost and schedule variance reporting) to clearly indicate status, and manage change, risks, and issues. Project status will always be visible to the State, and monitored by our corporate Project Management Office through a mandatory monthly client engagement health check process. A Weekly Risk Report (WRR) will be prepared and if any project health issues arise, corrective actions will be implemented. Corrective measures may include additional reporting and monitoring, and/or additional executive oversight of the engagement. This process has produced a perfect ERP implementation track record – truly the lowest risk delivery method.

MH

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk 1: Critical – The product selected as the foundation is not specifically suited for use in the public sector. This leads to compromising functional requirements and excessive customizations diluting the value of the ERP and leading to increased risk for schedule slippage and cost overruns. In a Southern California school district, after a delayed rollout and cost overruns, the district concluded, "It can't be fixed. They need to change the system, dump...and come up with a system that deals with [public sector] payroll only."
Mitigation: Right product. Implement a solution that has been successfully implemented in over 190 states, state departments, municipalities, and other government organizations. Our product's ~~native alignment to Alaska's requirements results in an 88% out-of-the-box fit. With our proposed value-added services and BPR, we can achieve a 100% fit.~~

Risk 2: Critical – The vendor team lacks implementation knowledge and specifics on Alaska systems. Inexperienced staff underestimates complexities, and fails to understand the scope and breadth of critical system interfaces, resulting in poor project scheduling, resourcing and staffing estimates. In August 2010, a California Bay Area county was forced to "rip and replace" its ailing ERP system which after four years of implementation met only 50% of the functionality required. The county complaint stated the vendor used the project as a "trial and error" training ground for inexperienced staff.
Mitigation: Right Team. Our project team only implements our ERP product; ~~each of our key project team members has successfully implemented our product in multiple states. Collectively, our team brings over 75 years~~ of field experience successfully implementing our product. Specifically, our ~~project manager has implemented our product in 6 states.~~ Our business/functional lead has also implemented our product in multiple states. Our DW/Reporting lead has extensive experience with other State of Alaska Departments the specific systems (AKSAS, AKPAY, WPA) that the new ERP is replacing, and Alaska's data warehouse and reporting solution (ALDER). Our project team, senior management, and system staff (which build and maintain our ERP product) bring Alaska a highly seasoned, proven team with a deep understanding of public sector ERP systems and direct Alaska experience.

Risk 3: Critical – Vendors without a standard methodology adapted specifically to the unique needs of Alaska will be unable to create and execute a realistic and achievable plan. The multi-phased implementation of an ERP is a complex undertaking requiring a comprehensive, proven approach to completing the project. This risk will result in key activities being omitted, an underestimate of the level of effort, and unrealistic time commitments for key State staff. The lack of a standard methodology tailored specifically to the needs of the State of Alaska will jeopardize project value, increase costs, and introduce unnecessary risk.
Mitigation: Right Methodology/Approach. Our estimates are based on factual historical metrics collected from over ~~190 implementations of our product in the state and local government space~~. For Alaska, we have crafted a comprehensive approach based on our in-depth understanding of the State's business environment, staff, and legacy systems. ~~We validated our Alaska plan for completeness and accuracy against these historical metrics.~~ We recognize that the implementation process is not a sprint and must make efficient use of resources over a period of years not weeks. Knowing state resources must continue supporting the business, legacy systems, and other time sensitive requests (e.g., implementing fund categories to meet GASB reporting requirements), our approach targets participation of state resources in a focused and balanced manner. This is the right approach to reduce the risk of schedule delays caused by unrealistic or uninformed expectations of state resource time and participation levels.

Risk 4: Critical – Attempting to integrate an ERP's standard reporting tool alongside or in place of ALDER increases implementation risk, reduces user efficiency, limits enterprise data access, increases maintenance and operations costs, and potentially jeopardize business continuity. As stated in the RFP, the new solution must be integrated with ALDER to support historical and current transactional reporting. ALDER is a complex and powerful reporting tool and integration is complex.
Mitigation: Right use of ALDER by integrating to the ERP solution. ~~Instead of relegating ALDER to a historical only repository or replacing it, our solution is to utilize ALDER as~~ the ~~reporting tool for ERP. This fully leverages Alaska's investment and takes advantage of ALDER's widespread adoption.~~ Data

MH

from our ERP solution will be loaded into the ALDER database and historical and current financial transaction reporting is done through ALDER's Business Objects front end. This will provide a statewide view of financial, procurement, and human resources data. As a result, Alaska staff will require minimal training on the new reports, and have broader access to strategic ERP data. ~~Our approach to ALDER as the reporting solution reduces license, maintenance and operating costs, while also reducing implementation risk and increasing user satisfaction and adoption of the new ERP system.~~

Risk 5: Severe – Not staffing for a multi-year project the size and complexity of Alaska ERP (which is more critical than for small, short duration, narrowly focused projects). Large, complex ERP projects require staff committed to the entire project lifecycle to avoid the risks associated with staff turnover – particularly of key senior staff. This turnover impacts timely and efficient decision making, compromises team collaboration, and impacts project schedule.
Mitigation: Right Staff Plan. We understand firsthand the unique challenges and costs of staffing a long-term project in Alaska with SMEs from other parts of the U.S. Climate, culture, and distance combine to create a unique set of project challenges in Alaska. We are committing one of our most seasoned, experienced, and dedicated project managers who has ~~started and successfully finished all six of the previous ERP projects she has managed.~~ Additionally our project manager will ~~relocate to Juneau~~ for the duration of the project to maximize time on-site, and to support effective collaboration with Alaska. Our functional/technical SMEs will work onsite for efficient collaboration and direct interaction with state staff. When appropriate, they will work remotely to minimize travel costs. ~~We have successfully applied this same distributed project team structure on other complex Alaska projects. Additionally, we have added a top ranked local Alaska IT partner with state systems experience and resources on the ground in Juneau to augment our data conversion activities and local on-site presence.~~

Risk 6: Severe – The tight linkage between AKSAS and AKPAY raises the risk of failure when an existing linkage is replaced in Phase 1 with the new ERP financial module. As described in the 2006 Business Case, a natural disaster (or system failure) impacting AKSAS or AKPAY during the implementation of the ERP could significantly impact the project schedule, and potentially result in the state incurring significant costs due to the outage (e.g. Penalty Pay).
Mitigation: Right Specific Disaster Protection Planning. Having worked with many state clients with similar legacy systems, ~~we have the expertise to assess potential failure points for uncommon natural disasters~~, and more common infrastructure, system, and configuration failures. In the pre-award planning phase, we will conduct a risk assessment of the AKSAS and AKPAY environments to identify potential failure points, then identify and implement risk mitigation strategies to guard against this risk.

Risk 7: Severe – The ERP is designed to serve a broad market audience. Products designed to support manufacturing, retail, and other commercial environments must consider the needs of all these industries when planning future enhancements. Alaska would compete for the limited R&D resources to maintain, sustain, and enhance the product, and be forced to develop workarounds to meet legislative mandates and federal directives.
Mitigation: Right Future. ~~Every dollar we spend on R&D is focused on government best practices and requirements. Alaska will be nominated to our User Steering Committee, and will have a much stronger voice in defining the future direction of new ERP releases.~~ Alaska benefits when enhancements to the baseline ERP are provided to all clients (e.g. to meet federal directives), and has the option to implement customizations into the Alaska codebase to accommodate state specific requirements.

Risk 8: Severe – Not having one primary responsible party. Solutions involving independent solution integrators and separate ERP software providers introduce multiple points of responsibility, clouding the resolution of issues encountered during implementation.
Mitigation: Right Combination. Our solution provides Alaska a ~~single point of accountability~~ for the project. Having this single point of accountability is a major factor in contributing to our ~~100% success rate of implementing government ERP solutions. The best mitigation is for the vendor to be the product owner/developer, product implementer, and maintenance provider with the expertise, knowledge, and resources.~~ This eliminates delays in communications, accessing baseline code changes, resolving technical issues, and obtaining support that often arise between separate organizations.

mt

Risk 9: Severe – A vendor approach that treats the implementation as three separate projects, each focusing on only one business area at a time. In a complex, multi-phase project, failing to clearly define the entire solution early may cause significant rework in later phases, and ultimately project failure.
Mitigation: Right Processes. Early in the project (Envision), we will create a ~~comprehensive blueprint for the entire solution~~, encompassing all verified requirements, business processes, and systems affected. The blueprint provides a holistic view of the entire ERP solution, including the interface of legacy systems with the new ERP, and is used to verify that scope and objectives are met during each stage of the project. For example, the ASSET project's TimeLink system requires custom interfaces with AKSAS and AKPAY. The blueprint helps the State understand how those custom ASSET interfaces are impacted when AKSAS and AKPAY are replaced, and how we plan work to avoid major changes and disruptions later. Similarly, the blueprint helps Alaska identify other legacy systems and processes which may be affected, but to date may not have been contemplated.

Risk 10: Severe-The criticality of the tight link between AKSAS and AKPAY is not understood by the vendor. AKPAY passes personal service cost information to AKSAS. This information must continue to be exchanged during the time between retirement of AKSAS and retirement of AKPAY. Without this interface, personnel expenditure costs will not available for reporting from ERP or ALDER.
Mitigation: Right Continuity. A current and working knowledge of the legacy systems will minimize this risk when used as input to the blueprint and interface design. ~~As part of preparing our response, we assessed the effort for existing interfaces between AKPAY and AKSAS~~ (e.g. labor distribution); ~~AKPAY and ALDER~~ (e.g. employee and position transactions); ~~AKSAS and ALDER~~ (e.g. structure, financial, reference transactions); ~~AKSAS, AKPAY, and ASSET~~ (labor, hours and leave); ~~and the HR indicative file while including them in our approach and plan.~~

Risk 11: Moderate – Software License Model constrains future growth and increases cost. The true total cost of ownership can be underestimated if the State has to undergo future "re-sizing" adjustments, audits from the software vendor, or expensive upgrades.
Mitigation: Right Licensing Model. We will issue the State an ~~enterprise license for our ERP product~~ with no restriction on the number of users or environments to be implemented. When the need arises to expand the usage of the ERP solution, ~~Alaska will not have any additional base ERP product license costs.~~

Risk 12: Moderate – Unrealistic and excessive demands for State staff during implementation and post-implementation causes delays, impacts to solution quality, and impacts to support levels. Vendors not familiar with the resource challenges present in state government often create project work plans based on faulty assumptions about the availability and capability of resources, assuming the State is able to divert key senior resources from their normal duties for extended periods of time. Additionally, these same vendors often create schedules with multiple large deliverables scheduled to be delivered at the same time or during peak work time, and with unrealistically short turn-around timeframes for approval.
Mitigation: Right Work Plan. Key state resources are highly leveraged on a day to day basis, and likely may have to perform their current job and support the project. Our approach will ~~use their time in a targeted manner to~~ review work products and desired process changes, and make decisions. To optimize their time, we will bring solutions rather than asking for lengthy explanations, and conduct walkthroughs with Alaska staff to make the review more efficient. Our existing, intimate knowledge of Alaska legacy systems and IT infrastructure will gives us the ability to work independently with reduced guidance or training from State staff. In addition, our structured mentor training program will prepare the AKPAY and AKSAS maintenance and operations resources (Analyst Programmers, System Programmers, Database Specialists, Data Processing Managers, etc.) to transition to the new ERP solution with minimal impact to their time. Our approach gradually transitions responsibility for maintenance and operations as each person gains sufficient proficiency. Since we provide hosting and support for our ERP, our team is also available as needed to augment state support staff further minimizing risks.

mH

VALUE ADDED

Item 1: Treasury Reciprocity Program (TRP) and Funding Potential
The TRP allows states to match vendor payments nationwide against Alaska debts. Vendor payments are offset and the funds are routed to Alaska for repayment. Three states, MD, NJ, and NY have collected over $69M in payments. A present client with similar size and budget estimates over $10M in debt collected from vendor payments. ~~For Alaska, this includes the interface to submit and receive debt information with the U.S. Treasury,~~ and to process offset payments in the ERP system. Alaska will realize payments in excess of $3M annually~~, and will have a pay back of less than one year~~. During the pre-award phase, a benefit funding approach will be discussed to support the implementation of this item.
Cost: $2,363,301

Item 2: Managed Services of the ERP Solution (Operations and Enhanced Maintenance).
This provides Alaska with a singular responsible contact for daily operation, issue resolution, version upgrades, Alaska specific configuration, and underlying 3rd-party software. Under an SLA, we proactively conduct performance tuning, capacity management and planning, identify future infrastructure needs as part of state planning cycles, and provide 24/7 production monitoring of the ERP system. We also provide management services for interfaces between the ERP and ALDER, ASSET, and ABS, and provide a 24/7 2nd level helpdesk. This service also provides Alaska with support for the State's disaster recovery system and three non-production systems (e.g. testing system). The benefits to Alaska include a singular point of contact and accountability for the entire ERP solution, enhanced business continuity, and 25% lower cost of ownership as a result of amortizing costs and deferring upfront expenditures. With this model, the application remains hosted within the State's data center with the State retaining control of the infrastructure and physical hardware. Collectively, this services model provides higher application stability, minimizes disruption of normal operations, and provides a level of services and support that is consistent with the critical needs of an ERP at a value-oriented price point.
Cost: Year 1 = $1,858,170 and thereafter Years 2-9 = $1,651,474 (Based on a 10-year term to be paid in annual installments at the beginning of each year).

Item 3: Enhanced "Strategic Fit" Customizations
We have identified 27 targeted customizations to our baseline ERP product, covering 84 requirements, that if implemented increase our out-of-the-box fit with Alaska requirements from 88% to 91%. These customizations will include asset management, overpayments, and leave, and will optimize the alignment and fit of our financial and payroll modules to the business needs required by Alaska.
Cost: $2,488,231

Item 4: Advanced Performance Budgeting (APB)
The retirement of the Alaska Budget System (ABS) should be considered as part of the implementation of the ERP solution. We can replace ABS with our APB solution, providing Alaska with the functionality required for comprehensive budget planning and analysis that is fully integrated with the ERP solution. APB will also provide broader budget management capabilities than currently available with ABS. Alaska gains the value of fully integrated budget planning and forecasting within the ERP, and eliminates the interface between ABS and the AKSAS and AKPAY systems, and the interfaces between ABS and the new ERP solution. This provides the legislative budget planning process with real time analysis capabilities of budgeted positions, and actual personnel costs. It provides up to date forecasting and analysis of currently encumbered and expended amounts, and the ability to easily perform "what-if" budget creation and analysis during the time-critical May through Sept re-appropriation period. The State will be able to easily analyze position vacancy rates, turnover, retirement projections, and the resulting impact to the personal services budgets. Forty-six of our clients have earned the "Distinguished Budget Presentation Award" from the Government Finance Officers Association using our APB budgeting capabilities.
Cost: $4,648,172 (This includes implementation services, license, and 10-year maintenance.)

Item 5: Grant Life Cycle Management (GLM) System
Each year Alaska departments receive and independently manage millions in grant funding. The lifecycle of a grant frequently spans multiple fiscal years and requires significant effort to track and administer successfully. Section 1512 of the American Recovery Reinvestment Act (ARRA 2009), instituted additional reporting requirements for federally funded grants that add to the overall burden. The GLM module provides Alaska with grant management capabilities ranging from identification and application, through award, execution, and closing phases. It also provides complete tracking and reporting of

mt

disbursements, expenses, overhead and indirect costs, produces ARRA required reports, and interfaces with the cost accounting module of our ERP, and the federal reporting portal (Reporting.Gov). The GLM module allows Alaska to act as either grantee or grantor, and brings uniformity across departments, increases the visibility of grant opportunities, and maximizes grant utilization. Clients using GLM have realized increased grant funding and streamlined grant management.
Cost: $655,173 (This includes implementation services, license, and 10-year maintenance.)

Item 6: Data Integrity

The success of data conversion, user acceptance testing (UAT), and overall implementation depend on the quality of legacy source data. Our expertise indicates that frequently states do not have the resources to maintain current operations, support the ERP implementation, and perform the analysis necessary to correct integrity issues prior to entering the critical UAT phase. To address this potential risk, ~~we will provide Alaska experienced resources to research and correct integrity issues prior to the implementation of the ERP.~~ Our knowledge of Alaska's legacy systems indicates that over the years, numerous software patches and "creative" use of data fields by end-users has introduced a number of data integrity issues. For example, the AKPAY and the WPA have an inter-system integrity issue with the job class code that identifies the position. The WPA system also employs a de-normalized database design and allows free form entry on key identifiers, such as the range and step of the recruitment. The Vendor file for AKSAS contains duplicative vendors and mistyped data elements, such as the city name where variations of the spelling of Juneau and other cities exist. With this value add service, Alaska will minimize implementation risk, and maximize the value of the ERP by resolving key integrity issues prior to implementation. ~~The modest amount of effort required to resolve the integrity issues as part of the data conversion will mitigate many downstream risks and issues.~~ This cost only applies to the identified systems being replaced by this base ERP implementation.
Cost: $421,770

Item 7: Expanded Analytics and Forecasting

Commissioners and administrators are tasked by the Governor's Office and Legislature to generate detailed analytical information, trending and forecasting data, often with short turnaround expectations. Our solution will use ALDER as the reporting engine, fully integrating the ERP data with historical information contained in the ALDER data warehouse to support statewide reporting. With this option, we can further extend ALDER's capabilities by adding additional advanced analytics and forecasting functionality to support predictive modeling from historical trends, current conditions, and what-if scenarios. With advanced analytics, departments will easily identify and compare historical service budgets against actual expenditures, identify amounts unexpended due to position vacancies, analyze vacancy trends due to turnover and retirement, and model predictions for upcoming fiscal years based on currently budgeted positions and incumbent range and step. This cost includes the addition of 3 ETLs and 5 additional reports.
Cost: $94,476

Item 8: Common 3rd Party Add Ons

There are a small number of Debt and Treasury and Learning Management requirements our baseline solution does not support. If these requirements are critical to the State, we have an established relationship with 3rd party providers that can deliver the required functionality. We have implemented and fully integrated these third party products for numerous other clients with a proven history of success. Alaska presently manages billions in short and long term debt and bonds. SymPro Debt and Treasury Management provides the State with a tool to efficiently manage debt service, redemptions, service providers, compliance, and reporting required for issuers of private debt and publicly traded bonds. With Debt and Treasury Management, issuers have a tool to create a comprehensive and user-friendly library of information on all outstanding obligations. Our 3rd party Learning Management System (LMS) provides Alaska with a robust education management system for all ERP modules. LMS includes creating and managing courses, enrolling participants, conducting training, collecting feedback, and managing educational material for directed (instructor led) and self-directed (participant managed) training. State staff can create individual profiles used to provide access to training and educational material, and to collect and store information related to the training modules.
Cost: SymPro Debt and Treasury $555,210; LMS $877,727 (Both include implementation services, license, and 10-year maintenance.)

mt

Complete the following table for each of the key proposed staff identified in the previous table. The individuals listed below shall be the individuals assigned to this project for the total duration of the project. These individuals cannot be replaced unless the State of Alaska provides approval. Create additional copies of this table as necessary. There is no page limit for completing these tables. This form must be completed as-is – standard resumes are not acceptable – however resumes for specific staff may be requested as a part of contract negotiations. At a minimum, you should provide information for the proposed project manager, technical lead, functional leads, process reengineering lead, as well as other staff members with substantial hours on the project

*** Staff member name**	[redacted]
*** Employer name**	[redacted]
Position in the company	Director of Consulting
Length of time in position	13 years
Length of time at company	20 years
Project position and responsibilities	Project Manager The Project Manager will be dedicated full-time for the duration of the ERP solution design, development and implementation and will be responsible for ensuring the project receives full corporate support, commitment, and oversight to meet all its contractual requirements. The Project Manager will provide on-site, day-to-day direction to the project effort to ensure staffing and other resource needs are met as required and to maintain accountability for project performance. The Project Manager will be responsible for managing contractual relationships and agreements, on-going risk management, communications for reporting, coordinating issue management with executive staff, and managing fiscal reporting. The Project Manager will also be responsible for providing quality assurance oversight on the overall ERP solution design and implementation and to expedite the discussion and resolution of architectural issues. The Project Manager will share their knowledge and experience gained on prior implementations by participating in system requirement definition and design meetings and providing input to process re-engineering activities.
Education and certifications	Bachelor of Arts - Business Administration - Eastern Washington University MBA - Business Administration - William Woods University Large Project Management Certificate ISO9001 Certified, Sarbanes-Oxley Trained

yes

yes

Technical skills and qualifications for the project position	Our Project Manager has extensive experience in project management for large complex implementations of administrative systems and improved business processes for state government entities, which include financial contracts in excess of $60M and staff of over 150. Our Project Manager has successfully implemented 6 statewide ERP solutions for various government clients to improve financial, budgeting, purchasing, payroll, personnel, and revenue collection systems. Our Project Manager has been responsible for managing requirements definitions, controlling scope, managing risks, coordinating client support, and the overall work planning and monitoring needed to successfully implement large complex system implementations. Our Project Manager has key expertise in facilitating and directing the system design, development, and implementation activities, including overall responsibility for the business design and architecture of the ERP solution. Her expertise includes hands-on experience addressing State business issues and processes including new mandated policies, like GASB 34, Governmental Accounting and Budgeting Standards, Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, Purchasing Policies, Fixed Assets including GASB 34 regulations. Technical Skills: Languages: COBOL, Basic, Pascal, C, XML, JAVA, J2EE Software: Harvard Graphics, Drawing Gallery, Business Objects, Crystal Reporting, MS Reporting Services, Adobe Forms Operating Environments: DB2, UNIX, MS SQL, Oracle, MVS, CICS, Websphere, Weblogic

*** Information contained in these fields will not be provided to the PEC during evaluation.**

Technical skills and qualifications for the project position	Our Business Process Reengineering Lead and Training Lead has spent 33 years working directly with federal, state, and local government clients and understands the unique aspects of government verses private sector organizations. She has previously worked with 15 state and local government entities on business process redesign and improvement efforts associated with statewide financial, tax and revenue, talent management, and receivables management system implementations. Our BPR Lead brings to the project the knowledge of proposed software functionality as well as business reengineering and process improvement principles coupled with project management, leadership, and negotiation skills. All of which will be necessary to help the State design their future business processes and to obtain concurrence for enterprise wide business process changes and improvements across multiple departments which may have conflicting interests. Our BPR Lead and Training Lead qualifications include prior experience working with 8 State and local government entities to lead and conduct BPR and Training activities associated with system implementations including the proposed software. She has successfully utilized the BPR and Training approach proposed for the State for a statewide financial system implementation which included the development and delivery of training to 15,000 students across multiple functional training sessions and across multiple physical locations some of which included remote locations with only 56kb internet access. Our Training and BPR Lead also holds an Organizational Development / Change Management Certification from Georgetown University.

*** Information contained in these fields will not be provided to the PEC during evaluation.**

Technical skills and qualifications for the project position	Our Finance/Procurement Functional Lead has over 28 years of public sector experience, which includes 11 years in Information Technology management positions within North Carolina state and local government entities. While working with the 10th largest county within North Carolina, our Finance/Procurement Functional Lead implemented the then current version of our proposed ERP solution and has direct experience from the client perspective. Since joining our firm, our Finance/Procurement Functional Lead has worked with public sector clients including cities, counties, school districts and 7 state governments to architect business and functional solutions using our proposed ERP software products. He possesses key expertise in Governmental Accounting and Budgeting Standards, Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, Purchasing and e-procurement, Fixed Assets, Inventory Management, Grants and Project Accounting and Reimbursement Billing, and Cost Accounting including Cost Allocations. Technical Skills: Languages: COBOL, JCL, SQL Software: Business Objects, Crystal Reporting, Adobe Forms Operating Environments: Windows, UNIX, MVS, VSE, CICS, WebSphere, DB2, Oracle

† **Information contained in these fields will not be provided to the PEC during evaluation.**