

Cherry Road CONFID DOC
GOOD LBR SPLIT - VENDOR MORE THAN ST.

PROJECT WORK PLAN

1. Offeror's Methodology - Our methodology is comprised of five phases of discrete activities and three bands of continual activities. A high-level overview of the methodology is given below, followed by references to each of the key activities within the methodology that specifically manage scope, schedule, and the implementation.

Phases: Phases occur at defined junctures in the project lifecycle. The phases are as follows:

01 - Initiation - Plan the project and create its foundation

02 - Design - Design future State business processes to meet the State's functional requirements

03 - Development - Implement the system design decisions from the Design Phase

04 - Validation - Test the system and take it into production

05 - Post-Implementation - Support the live production system

Bands: Bands are made up of continual tasks that occur throughout the project lifecycle as follows:

Project Management - Direct, monitor, and control the project throughout the implementation lifecycle

Quality Management - Assure that project outcomes, documents, and procedures best meet the needs of the State and the project

Enterprise Readiness - Assure that the State's organization is ready and able to adopt the new business processes

Managing Project Scope: The primary mechanism for managing project scope is the agreed upon Statement of Work (SOW) between the State and the Offeror. By working with the State upfront to put in place a comprehensive and realistic SOW, we have a solid scope that drives ongoing scope management throughout the project. Scope Management is part of our Project Management Band and happens continually throughout the project lifecycle. The goals of Scope Management are twofold:

A. Ensure that the SOW scope is fully met through project activities. **B.** Ensure that SOW scope is not exceeded, in other words: prevent scope creep. A primary ongoing task to manage scope is the setting of deliverable expectations for each SOW deliverable via a Deliverable Expectation Document (DED). Each DED documents the State's and the Offeror's expectations for a deliverable before work begins. By documenting and reinforcing the agreed-to scope upfront, the DED ensures the deliverable meets the SOW and helps to mitigate scope creep.

Managing Project Schedule: During the Initiation Phase, we take the lead on defining the Baseline Project Work Plan. As specified by the State, this plan will be built using Microsoft Project 2003. A key tool used in managing this schedule is Microsoft Project Server 2007. We will import the initial MS Project 2003 plan into our MS Project Server 2007 and rollout the usage of the web-based tool to most State and Offeror team members, allowing them to view and update project task details such as percentage complete. By decentralizing project plan maintenance in this manner, we ensure the most up to date information is included in the project schedule. We have successfully used this approach on prior Statewide ERP implementations. We have seen that having the continually updated information allows State and Offeror project management to identify potential schedule and plan issues early and put in place mitigation steps to keep the project schedule on track.

Managing Project Implementation: Managing the implementation as a whole is led by the Offeror Project Manager and other Offeror management team members. The methodology described above is used by our project management team to guide the implementation. The methodology is enhanced by our robust Proprietary Tool Kit (PTK) application, which is a specialized tool, built on a [REDACTED] platform and used to perform, monitor, and control key project tasks. State and Offeror team members will use this application to document key project tasks including Requirements Management, Issues Management, System Design, and Integration/System Testing. One of the key benefits of this application is the project data is stored in a database and can easily be summarized and reported on, providing management with timely data to enable informed management decisions. For example, our prior State government clients were able use the PTK to access on-demand reports of real-time System Test execution data at any time during testing. These reports include status of test scenarios, summarized by module area or project-wide, including planned and actual percentage completion and failure rates. Other PTK testing reports link failed scenarios to documented issues to enable monitoring and controlling of the issue resolution and retesting processes.

2. Offeror's Approach to:

System Initialization: The Offeror will build environments in accordance with the delivered software vendor installation instructions. Environments are built with the selected application and latest tools

T.M

release. Generally, all maintenance packs available for the application release will be installed.

System Installation: The baseline technical architecture is installed during Phase 01 – Initiation of our methodology. As the implementation progresses, the Offeror is responsible for installing the various environments necessary to support project activities including: system design, development, system testing, and go-live. During the development phase, the Gold environment, the most critical environment, is installed. The Gold instance contains the final version of configuration and development and is used for initiating each system test cycle and is the production environment used for go-live.

Business Process Design/Reengineering: Business process design, or system design, occurs in Phase 02, but is the central and essential step to everything that occurs during the implementation. Led by the Offeror, the system design involves a collaborative approach to design and document the State's future business processes. A key aspect of system design is making a final determination of how State business practices are adjusted to reflect the business processes enabled by the delivered ERP application. Produced from our PTK application, the system design document deliverable breaks out each business process into each key step. For each business process, the design outlines the future business process steps and their relationships to key business roles, development, and the ERP software. This design drives the configuration, development, and testing that occurs later in the project.

System Configuration: System Configuration is an important step in Phase 03 of our methodology. Offeror resources are accountable for building a configuration into a Gold environment after system design. It is important for State resources to assist because it enables knowledge transfer, on-the-job training, and reduced support structure post go-live. Offeror provides a configuration tool for tracking completeness, documenting decisions, and managerial reporting.

System Tailoring: Occurring in Phase 03, tailoring of the software involves detailed design, development, and unit testing of targeted enhancements to the delivered software functionality to meet the State's requirements. The detailed design of enhancements is led by the Offeror functional team with full participation from the State functional team and specifies the needed functionality. Development is performed by the Offeror technical team to create the code and pages designed by the functional team. Unit testing is led by the Offeror functional team with participation from the State functional team and consists of testing of targeted scenarios to ensure the enhancement meets the detailed design specification. Our PTK application tool is used to track documentation and status around detailed design, development, and unit testing as described above in Managing Project Implementation.

Interface Design and Development: Occurring in Phase 03, interface design and development follows the same steps as the enhancement steps described under System Tailoring: detailed design, development, and unit testing. The detailed design includes a full file layout that defines calculation logic, transformation rules, source/target fields, valid field values, field lengths, etc.

Data Conversion: Also, a Phase 03 activity, data conversion, is grouped into individual development items that each follow the same steps as the enhancement steps described under System Tailoring: detailed design, development, and unit testing. The detailed design process involves conversion mapping that is led by the Offeror with contribution from State functional and technical experts. The output of conversion mapping is a full conversion map used for developing both the State's extracts from the legacy systems and the Offeror's load processes into the ERP.

Testing: System testing is essential to Phase 04 – Validation. It involves using the ERP system to test the designed business processes, including State configuration, enhancements, interfaces, and conversion data. In our iterative testing approach, we plan three primary cycles of testing: integration, system, and user acceptance. Integration involves the most critical business processes, system involves the full breadth of business processes, and user acceptance involves user-affecting business processes.

Post-Implementation Stabilization: During Phases 03 and 04, the Offeror will lead the development of a production support plan. Post-Implementation support and stabilization involves putting the production support plan into action when each phase of the ERP system is released. During the support period, application support is a shared responsibility between State and Offeror project staff. State project staff will be the primary point of contact for end users of the ERP, while the Offeror performs an active role in supporting all other support activities including issue resolution. This enables State staff to ready themselves for independent long-term production support of the application after Offeror support ends.

3. Transition - The State has indicated a strong preference for a phased implementation with financials/procurement first followed by HR/ Payroll. The Offeror refers to this approach as a Phased by Application approach and the following sections describe this benefits and challenges of this

TM

approach and the Offeror's experience.

Experience and Challenges of the Phased by Application: The Offeror very recently performed a Statewide government implementation of financials/procurement and human resources applications using the Phased by Application approach where the HR/Payroll and Financials/Procurement initiatives had minimal overlap. Utilizing this approach was beneficial in several ways to our client. First, cross initiative resources (including PMO, Technical, Organizational Readiness, Training, etc.) were not overburdened with the complexity and work of two initiatives going live at the same time. Second, while the total change to the organization was the same it was easier to digest in multiple initiatives. Third, each initiatives go live was not dependent on the other helping avoid the situation of one initiative's readiness for go live impacting the other. While there were benefits of this approach there were also several challenges that needed to be managed. First, several complex interfaces were required between the [REDACTED] system and legacy system. Second, when the second initiative integration was built additional regression testing was needed for the first initiative applications to ensure nothing was changed. Third, cross initiative resources need to stay focused on the next initiative and not get sidetracked into production support issues.

Proposed Transition Strategy: To take advantage of the benefits of the Phased by Application approach while ensuring we address the challenges, we propose that the first implementation of Financials/Procurement not overlap with the second implementation. Initiative 1, Financials/Procurement, will be implemented first following the Offeror's 5 phase/3 band methodology. Once Initiative 1 has gone live and entered Phase 05, then the next implementation will begin with Phase 01 for Initiative 2, HR/Payroll. The Financials/Procurement initiative will include temporary business processes to interact with the State's legacy human resources and payroll systems. The State must plan to staff the HR/Payroll project team during the financials/procurement project to design and support the temporary business processes. The HR/Payroll initiative will include implementation of new business processes for interaction between HR/Payroll and Financials/Procurement. This will necessitate additional testing for Initiative 1 that will need to be staffed by the State. The Offeror will include full-time Financials/Procurement staffing to support implementation of the new HR/Payroll business processes. Lastly, the proposed staffing plan ensures that there are dedicated production support resources allowing the Cross Initiative resources to focus on Initiative 2.

4. Educate and Train – Two key facets of our methodology serve to educate and train the State on the proposed systems: knowledge transfer between the Offeror project team and State project team and training of the end-user population.

Knowledge Transfer: Knowledge transfer (KT) is an ongoing task that is part of the Enterprise Readiness Band. It is expected to occur three different ways for State team members: (1) project task assignments, working side-by-side with Offeror consultants; (2) project relationships and interactions with Offeror coaches and other team members; and, (3) project team training typically delivered by the ERP software vendor. Using our PTK application, we measure KT at certain predefined junctures through a combination of State self-assessment and Offeror peer assessments. This measurement allows the State and Offeror to gauge progress towards KT goals and recognize and address any KT deficiencies.

Training: Training is part of Phase 04. The delivery of end-user training will be a combination of blended training course offerings. The percentage breakdown of blended courses is determined during curriculum sessions and is tailored to meet the State's unique business and geographic challenges. Types of training offered include: Instructor Led Classroom Delivery, Online Training, and Job Aids.

5. Monitor Performance - The Quality Management Band involves ongoing processes to ensure project processes and outcomes best meet the needs of the State and the SOW.

Quality Management: Our Quality Manager is responsible for devising the project Quality Management Plan and overseeing its execution. The plan consists of Quality Control tasks during project activities as well as Quality Assurance tasks for future project activities and deliverables. Quality controls, such as checklists, templates, peer reviews, and so forth, are performed upfront by State and Offeror team members throughout all areas of the project team including functional, technical, and enterprise readiness. This enables a consistent standard of quality throughout the project. Quality Assurance involves assessment of project deliverables, work products, and other outcomes to analyze, assess, and adapt the quality of the project's outcomes. While Quality Control is ingrained in the initial completion of project tasks, Quality Assurance is typically performed following completion and sign-off of critical project tasks with the goal being improvement in quality of future project tasks.

TJM

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk 1: Core Users are defined as those employees or key State experts who will be part of the project team to support the ERP Implementation effort. These Core Users will encounter competing priorities from the ongoing demands of their regular jobs as well as from the new duties and responsibilities inherent with the ERP Project.

Solution: To mitigate this risk, the Offeror is using our substantial statewide ERP implementation experience to recommend that Core Users should be moved from their legacy jobs to a representative job on the ERP Project. Specifically, the following changes should be made to minimize the need for Core Users to be required to participate in the ongoing, day-to-day demands of legacy operations:

- Develop a plan for post-implementation such that Core Users know upfront what their jobs will be after the implementation effort is complete.
- Backfill Core User positions with qualified individuals and hold the new employees accountable for legacy activities, duties and responsibilities.
- Move Core Users to a designated location established for ERP.
- Change Core User phone contact information or appropriate delegation message.
- Transfer cost centers to one that has been established for ERP.
- If possible, supplement Core Users with recent college graduates so knowledge is kept with more than one resource and there is opportunity to have them perform day-to-day tasks.

Risk 2: Ineffective Project Governance Structure and Processes

Solution: It is well known that all major statewide ERP projects must have a clear, effective, and functioning Project Governance structure and processes. At a minimum, the project governance structure and process should be documented as part of the Project Charter and include:

- Executive Sponsor Roles and Responsibilities
- Steering Committee Structure and Role
- Team Roles and Responsibilities
- Effective and Timely Decision Making Process
- A Fair and Effective Dispute Resolution Process
- Development of appropriate interagency agreements.

The Offeror has a vast amount of statewide ERP implementation experience and has a very pertinent example for governing these large State ERP implementations. A past client with two wholly different governance structures was implementing an ERP application within the same database. One governance structure and escalation process was more hierarchical in nature while the other was far more consensus driven. This led to different throughput times for decision making and also materially different rationale for decision making. Ultimately, a project governance structure was formed that these two very different organizations rolled up to one person that could make decisions for both organizations.

Risk 3: Self Service is a key success factor and a risk of failed user adoption if not properly deployed for the State and a major Change Management opportunity affecting both procurement and payment processing.

Solution: The Offeror will have a two pronged strategy to the change management opportunity for Self Services.

First, the Offeror will create a lessons learned chart during a one calendar month duration of the Project Planning time period from the State's implementation of the ASSETS system that consists of an inventory for lessons learned that will map to project plan tasks to ensure those lessons learned are performed during the project.

Second, the Offeror will use the proven methodology for change management issues using the business process flow below.

1. Clarifying the Self Service requirements in Requirement Verification Sessions. This initiates traceability and proper design of solutions to the requirements.
2. Compare the Self Service requirements vs. the delivered software to understand modification needs. These Fit Sessions incorporate agency users and continue knowledge transfer.
3. Most importantly, use the Self Service requirements to design the To-Be Business processes. An output of the business processes are change management opportunities. These change

TM

management opportunities are then taken by the change management staff and socialized to the end users.

4. The socialization is done via the Business Process Implementation sessions which allow the agencies to view the To-Be business processes and also adjust their business processes accordingly ahead of the cycle testing.

Risk 4: Reluctant Agency Ownership

Solution: One of our large state customers had several agencies that believed the statewide ERP project would "never happen" especially after a long and protracted procurement process for software and services. Many agencies did not send appropriate representatives to participate in the system design and development effort. Other agencies did not bother to participate at all. Eventually, in the few short months prior to cutting over to the new application, these agencies realized that they had no staff trained and competent to use the new system. In addition, many requirements of these agencies were not addressed in the new ERP system due to lack of participation particularly during the Design Phase. Now committed to using the new system, the agencies lengthened and increased the painful transition process and slowed overall user adoption.

In the Offeror's many State ERP implementations, risk mitigation strategies have been learned to decrease the risk of reluctant agency involvement. The processes put in place to decrease this risk include:

- Collaborative Agency and Core User Requirement Verification and Fit Gap Sessions
- Dedicated Change Management Team with many years of State ERP experience
- Business Process Implementation Sessions that enable design decisions to be socialized to agencies
- Agency Scorecards that rate agency implementation effectiveness
- Organizational Alignment Workshops

Risk 5: The application phased approach will introduce temporary business processes and temporary interfaces between the Financials and Human Resources go-lives.

Solution: The Offeror very recently performed a Statewide government implementation of financials/procurement and human resources applications with this approach, as was requested by that State. The implementation timelines were overlapping, with the first application (HR/payroll) going live after approximately 2 years and the second application (financials/procurement) being released in waves beginning after approximately 2.5 years. This concurrent approach ultimately impacted the project effort and timelines because of the need to implement temporary business processes while also incorporating changes from the later financials/procurement implementation back into the earlier HR/payroll design. For example, the financials/procurement testing occurred after most HR/payroll testing had been completed and when issues with financials/procurement that impacted HR/payroll were found, there was less time for HR/payroll to address the issues prior to go-live.

The implementation of financials/procurement will include significant temporary business processes to interact with the State's legacy human resources and payroll systems. The State must plan to staff the HR/payroll project team during the financials/procurement project to design and support the temporary business processes. Additionally, the Offeror will provide full-time HR/payroll staffing to help coordinate the temporary business processes and also participate in design decisions that impact the future HR/payroll implementation.

The HR/payroll implementation will include implementation of new business processes for interaction between HR/payroll and financials/procurement. The State must plan to keep a significant staffed presence for financials/procurement throughout the HR/payroll implementation. The Offeror will include full-time financials/procurement staffing to support implementation of the new HR/payroll business processes. It is critical to note that both the State and Offeror staff assigned to participate in HR/payroll from a financials/procurement perspective are over, above, and separate from any staff assigned to production support for financials/procurement.

Risk 6– Multiple system implementers add significant complexity to ERP project governance. The Offeror has participated in a statewide ERP effort where project governance was comprised due to multiple system implementers that were joined together to plan, develop and deliver the ERP solution. Furthermore, baseline risks that are inherent in complex ERP implementations are significantly magnified

TM

when using multiple system implementers. In hindsight, the project was impacted by competing goals, methodologies and leadership, thereby adding unnecessary complexity to the project and resulting significant loss of value, money and time.

The associated risks from a team made up of multiple system implementers are below:

- **Project Governance**

- **Methodologies** – Each system implementer brought distinct software development methodologies. Socializing those methodologies took a significant amount of time and resources thereby increasing costs and decreasing value. Key resources needed to concentrate on disjointed methodologies instead of software development.
- **Project Leadership** – Each implementer wanted to lead a portion of the project at the functional, technical and project management levels. This strategy resulted in poor communication between implementers and made the coordination of project tasks and issues significantly more difficult. More often than not, the Offeror experienced ineffective and disjointed leadership and communication.

- **Management Overhead**

- **Logistical Inconsistencies and Coordination** – Each system implementer had differing policies for team travel, offsite meetings, training, time and attendance and human resource functions. These different core project tasks increased the overhead of project management by increasing the complexity of normal day-to-day tasks. From the Client's perspective, this additional overhead created a fractured team.
- **Competing Goals** – As client goals changed throughout the lifecycle of the ERP project, coordination between system implementers became more difficult and caused a significant and costly overhead to the project management team.

Solution – With successful completion of many statewide ERP projects, the Offeror has found that having a single source responsible for the implementation is the best strategy. With a single implementer, the risks of diverse methodologies, multiple leaders, conflicting policies and competing goals will be minimized. Overall project coordination will be simplified and team members will work towards succinct goals.

VALUE ADDED

Item 1: Item Maintenance

Faced with the slow, manual process of updating the information contained in their enterprise application systems, the Offeror's past statewide client needed a solution that would allow them to manage over 100,000 items, integrate them with their inventory system, and build upon existing supplier catalogs. Adding or updating the item master or procurement attribute information would require a largely manual process that would put an immense strain on resource staffing levels. Additionally, the slow process of updating these items leads to inconsistent approaches as managers attempt to short-cut the tremendous efforts involved.

Typical item maintenance requires manually extracting, reviewing, and correcting item data. Staff must be highly-trained and vigilant, with specialized skills for using tools like Microsoft Access databases or Microsoft Excel. Most organizations don't have enough of these specialty personnel, and the Offeror's past client is no different.

Generally, the solution for addressing these large sets of data is a combination of conversion programs using staff to extract, review, update, reload, and validate the item data. While this process is less-intensive than a purely manual update, it is still time-consuming and prone to error.

The Offeror, who worked with the past client on the statewide ERP project, created and implemented the Content Tool Solution, an integrated item-maintenance solution to address their specific needs. The Content Tool Solution is built on a comprehensive methodology that aggregates large sets of item data so they can be manipulated by an end-user, without assistance from technical resources. The data managers are now able to focus on their main priorities, high-visibility items, or specific sets of data, while re-working the attributes immediately, or to continually improve data accuracy and procurement controls as needed.

The fully-integrated Content Tool Solution includes the following features:

- Allows for efficient mass conversion and updating of category tables, tree manager, enabling management of electronic vendor catalogs.
- Allows for the creation of Catalog Requests to send to vendors or internal agencies for the purpose of electronic catalog loading and updates with built-in approvals, audit trails, reporting and queries.
- Provides over 200 validation checks against master tables and other configured logic.
- Requires no technical assistance, yet incorporates more than 4,000 fields, 300 tables, and utilizes the ERP software's delivered Application Security.

The Content Tool Solution enables procurement and inventory managers to have total control over each item's data in an easy-to-use, powerful, fully-integrated module. Users can automatically sort, filter, and process over 50,000 items in a matter of seconds or minutes, a process that done manually could easily take weeks or months. The Offeror's past client now has the ability to stage and update items based on any field values, such as category code, family code, buyer, vendor, description, manufacturer, or inspection code.

Cost: \$30,000

Item 2: Offeror's Methodology Toolkit

The Offeror's Proprietary Toolkit (PTK) Application is a custom and proprietary, value-added toolset built on an ERP application platform and hosted by the Offeror's Data Center. The tool includes features to support the Offeror's work in implementing ERP systems, including design, development, and validation (testing). This tool promotes efficiency, standardization, and transparency across the project.

Design: The PTK provides a central tracking system to enable the best and most efficient design of the State's business processes. For instance, the tool will track each of the State's software requirements from the point of identification, through the Fit Analysis process, into the System Design of business processes, and finally into System Testing of the designed business processes. Using the powerful ERP Application reporting and query tools, the requirements can be easily analyzed at critical project juncture to see where they stand against planned targets and metrics. This tool helps ensure that the State's business processes meet each and every of its requirements.

Development: The PTK provides a central tool for documentation of detailed design, development, and unit testing of all development items (also known as development requests (DRs) throughout the project lifecycle. Types of DRs contained within the tool include conversions, interfaces, reports, workflows, and enhancements. The tool houses detailed design information for each DR in a standardized format, including business logic, conversion layouts, user interface (page) designs, security specifications, and so

TM

forth. The tool also tracks detailed documentation supporting the actual development/programming effort, such as affected object inventory references and reusable procedures specifications. Finally, the tool tracks specific unit test scenarios, including expected results, data values, and actual results.

Validation: The PTK includes powerful tools for planning, executing, and tracking System Test cycles. The tool enables planning of test cycles through development of test scripts and test scenarios. For efficiency, these scripts and scenarios can be developed once but used and reused in multiple cycles of testing, including System Test and Acceptance Test. Test execution results for each script and scenario are entered directly into the PTK during testing. This allows standardization of test results, early identification of result trends, and the most up-to-date status reporting for management.

Cost: \$25,000 for Remote Hosting

Item 3: Third Party Solutions

Within the Exhibit F - Software Functionality and Technical Requirements there are several requirements that could be met by third party solutions. The Offeror has not provided costs in our core offer, but present them here as value added solutions.

- Offeror software will meet the barcoding requirements (requirement 1026, 1027, 1074, and 4103). The software will provide functionality beyond that specified in the RFP, so it is appropriate to list here in the value add section:
 - Cost: Asset Advantage Base Application, \$10,000 (for use with the PI portion of the application)
 - 1-10 Licensed Users w/Hardware - \$4,700 each (w/o terminals @ \$2,500 each)
 - 11+ Licensed Users w/Hardware - \$3,200 each (w/o terminals @ \$1,000 each)
 - Services (Modifications, Configuration & Training and travel), \$41,000
 - Scanners for PC's, \$500 each and Pre-printed Labels, \$2,000 for 10,000
- Offeror service provides a subscription based service to meet the clean address requirement 1740 and 2050.
 - Cost: \$5695 per year for up to 120K address verifications.
- Offeror software will meet the retail cashiering requirements (requirement 1673-1682). The software will provide functionality beyond that specified in the RFP, so it is appropriate to list here in the value add section:
 - Cost: License = \$100k based on 25 registers
 - Implementation =400k, unlimited registers. Initial rollout and creation of golden CD which can be loaded on each register after pilot.

Item 4: ERP Recruiting Module

Implement the fully integrated recruiting module for job openings, recruiting and new hires.

Cost: Software Cost: Estimate \$250,000

Item 5: ERP – Policy Automation Module

Policy automation solution enables government agencies throughout the world to effectively deliver services and fairly and consistently determine legislated and policy obligations. The fundamental objective of our policy solution is to enable much greater direct participation by policy experts in the development of eligibility systems by directly transforming regulations, legislation, and other policy documents into executable business rules.

Cost:TBD**

Item 6: Governance, Risk and Compliance Module

Without the ability to coordinate and consolidate governance, risk, and compliance (GRC) activities, organizations cannot rise to calls for greater accountability, nor can they evaluate and manage potential threats to the organization, all the while keeping resources and costs in check.

Cost: TBD**

Item 7: Master Data Management Module

Many organizations still don't have a true view of their citizen and suppliers, much less their inventory and financials. Although they invest in new, sophisticated enterprise applications to handle business processes, the data those systems generate is not centrally managed. Master Data Management solutions are designed to consolidate, cleanse, and enrich key business data from across the enterprise, and synchronize it with all applications, business processes, and analytical tools.

COST: TBD** NOTE: MODULE PRICING WILL BE BASED ON NUMEROUS FOOTPRINT FACTORS

TM

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	14,150	20,215
2. Project status reports	7,075	10,107
3. Weekly risk reports	7,075	10,107
4. Satisfaction surveys	2,830	4,043
5. System configuration reports	7,075	10,107
6. Business process modification recommendations	9,905	14,150
7. Configured software ready for test	7,075	10,107
8. Accepted workflows	7,075	10,107
9. Hardware specification (applicable to licensed solution)	2,830	4,043
10. Application architecture documentation	2,830	4,043
11. Installation certification document	4,250	4,043
12. Data conversion plan	7,075	10,107
13. Validated migrated data	7,075	10,107
14. Reports	2,830	4,043
15. Interface specifications	2,830	4,043
16. Tested interfaces	4,250	10,107
17. Test plan	7,075	10,107
18. Volume/stress testing report	7,075	10,107
19. Training plan	4,250	6,064
20. Training materials	4,245	6,064
21. Training	4,245	6,064
22. Knowledge transfer plan and activity	2,830	4,043
23. Go-live and stabilization plan	2,830	4,043
24. Technical operations manual	2,830	4,043
25. Business user manual	2,830	4,043
26. Configured and licensed software in productive use	2,830	4,043
27. Stabilization services	2,830	4,043

140,100

202,143

PROJECT WORK PLAN

1. **Offeror's Methodology** - Our methodology is comprised of five phases of discrete activities and three bands of continual activities. A high-level overview of the methodology is given below, followed by references to each of the key activities within the methodology that specifically manage scope, schedule, and the implementation.

Phases: Phases occur at defined junctures in the project lifecycle. The phases are as follows:

01 - **Initiation** - Plan the project and create its foundation

02 - **Design** - Design future State business processes to meet the State's functional requirements

03 - **Development** - Implement the system design decisions from the Design Phase

04 - **Validation** - Test the system and take it into production

05 - **Post-Implementation** - Support the live production system

Bands: Bands are made up of continual tasks that occur throughout the project lifecycle as follows:

Project Management - Direct, monitor, and control the project throughout the implementation lifecycle

Quality Management - Assure that project outcomes, documents, and procedures best meet the needs of the State and the project

Enterprise Readiness - Assure that the State's organization is ready and able to adopt the new business processes

Managing Project Scope: The primary mechanism for managing project scope is the agreed upon **Statement of Work (SOW)** between the State and the Offeror. By working with the State upfront to put in place a comprehensive and realistic SOW, we have a solid scope that drives ongoing scope management throughout the project. Scope Management is part of our Project Management Band and happens continually throughout the project lifecycle. The goals of Scope Management are twofold:

A. Ensure that the SOW scope is fully met through project activities. **B.** Ensure that SOW scope is not exceeded, in other words: prevent scope creep. A primary ongoing task to manage scope is the setting of deliverable expectations for each SOW deliverable via a Deliverable Expectation Document (DED). Each DED documents the State's and the Offeror's expectations for a deliverable before work begins. By documenting and reinforcing the agreed-to scope upfront, the DED ensures the deliverable meets the SOW and helps to mitigate scope creep.

Managing Project Schedule: During the Initiation Phase, we take the lead on defining the Baseline Project Work Plan. As specified by the State, this plan will be built using Microsoft Project 2003. A key tool used in managing this schedule is Microsoft Project Server 2007. We will import the initial MS Project 2003 plan into our MS Project Server 2007 and rollout the usage of the web-based tool to most State and Offeror team members, allowing them to view and update project task details such as percentage complete. By decentralizing project plan maintenance in this manner, we ensure the most up to date information is included in the project schedule. We have successfully used this approach on prior Statewide ERP implementations. We have seen that having the continually updated information allows State and Offeror project management to identify potential schedule and plan issues early and put in place mitigation steps to keep the project schedule on track.

Managing Project Implementation: Managing the implementation as a whole is led by the Offeror Project Manager and other Offeror management team members. The methodology described above is used by our project management team to guide the implementation. The methodology is enhanced by our robust Proprietary Tool Kit (PTK) application, which is a specialized tool, built on a [REDACTED] platform and used to perform, monitor, and control key project tasks. State and Offeror team members will use this application to document key project tasks including Requirements Management, Issues Management, System Design, and Integration/System Testing. One of the key benefits of this application is the project data is stored in a database and can easily be summarized and reported on, providing management with timely data to enable informed management decisions. For example, our prior State government clients were able use the PTK to access on-demand reports of real-time System Test execution data at any time during testing. These reports include status of test scenarios, summarized by module area or project-wide, including planned and actual percentage completion and failure rates. Other PTK testing reports link failed scenarios to documented issues to enable monitoring and controlling of the issue resolution and retesting processes.

2. **Offeror's Approach to:**

System Initialization: The Offeror will build environments in accordance with the delivered software vendor installation instructions. Environments are built with the selected application and latest tools

- Statement of Work

- use Key Project Tasks

- on demand reports

JB

release. Generally, all maintenance packs available for the application release will be installed.

System Installation: The baseline technical architecture is installed during Phase 01 – Initiation of our methodology. As the implementation progresses, the Offeror is responsible for installing the various environments necessary to support project activities including: system design, development, system testing, and go-live. During the development phase, the Gold environment, the most critical environment, is installed. The Gold instance contains the final version of configuration and development and is used for initiating each system test cycle and is the production environment used for go-live.

-coll. approach

Business Process Design/Reengineering: Business process design, or system design, occurs in Phase 02, but is the central and essential step to everything that occurs during the implementation. Led by the Offeror, the system design involves a collaborative approach to design and document the State's future business processes. A key aspect of system design is making a final determination of how State business practices are adjusted to reflect the business processes enabled by the delivered ERP application. Produced from our PTK application, the system design document deliverable breaks out each business process into each key step. For each business process, the design outlines the future business process steps and their relationships to key business roles, development, and the ERP software. This design drives the configuration, development, and testing that occurs later in the project.

System Configuration: System Configuration is an important step in Phase 03 of our methodology. Offeror resources are accountable for building a configuration into a Gold environment after system design. It is important for State resources to assist because it enables knowledge transfer, on-the-job training, and reduced support structure post go-live. Offeror provides a configuration tool for tracking completeness, documenting decisions, and managerial reporting.

System Tailoring: Occurring in Phase 03, tailoring of the software involves detailed design, development, and unit testing of targeted enhancements to the delivered software functionality to meet the State's requirements. The detailed design of enhancements is led by the Offeror functional team with full participation from the State functional team and specifies the needed functionality. Development is performed by the Offeror technical team to create the code and pages designed by the functional team. Unit testing is led by the Offeror functional team with participation from the State functional team and consists of testing of targeted scenarios to ensure the enhancement meets the detailed design specification. Our PTK application tool is used to track documentation and status around detailed design, development, and unit testing as described above in Managing Project Implementation.

-testing

Interface Design and Development: Occurring in Phase 03, interface design and development follows the same steps as the enhancement steps described under System Tailoring: detailed design, development, and unit testing. The detailed design includes a full file layout that defines calculation logic, transformation rules, source/target fields, valid field values, field lengths, etc.

-con mapping

Data Conversion: Also, a Phase 03 activity, data conversion, is grouped into individual development items that each follow the same steps as the enhancement steps described under System Tailoring: detailed design, development, and unit testing. The detailed design process involves conversion mapping that is led by the Offeror with contribution from State functional and technical experts. The output of conversion mapping is a full conversion map used for developing both the State's extracts from the legacy systems and the Offeror's load processes into the ERP.

Testing: System testing is essential to Phase 04 – Validation. It involves using the ERP system to test the designed business processes, including State configuration, enhancements, interfaces, and conversion data. In our iterative testing approach, we plan three primary cycles of testing: integration, system, and user acceptance. Integration involves the most critical business processes, system involves the full breadth of business processes, and user acceptance involves user-affecting business processes.

-support plan

Post-Implementation Stabilization: During Phases 03 and 04, the Offeror will lead the development of a production support plan. Post-Implementation support and stabilization involves putting the production support plan into action when each phase of the ERP system is released. During the support period, application support is a shared responsibility between State and Offeror project staff. State project staff will be the primary point of contact for end users of the ERP, while the Offeror performs an active role in supporting all other support activities including issue resolution. This enables State staff to ready themselves for independent long-term production support of the application after Offeror support ends.

Phase imp

3. Transition - The State has indicated a strong preference for a phased implementation with financials/procurement first followed by HR/ Payroll. The Offeror refers to this approach as a Phased by Application approach and the following sections describe this benefits and challenges of this

SB

approach and the Offeror's experience.

Experience and Challenges of the Phased by Application: The Offeror very recently performed a Statewide government implementation of financials/procurement and human resources applications using the Phased by Application approach where the HR/Payroll and Financials/Procurement initiatives had minimal overlap. Utilizing this approach was beneficial in several ways to our client. First, cross initiative resources (including PMO, Technical, Organizational Readiness, Training, etc.) were not overburdened with the complexity and work of two initiatives going live at the same time. Second, while the total change to the organization was the same it was easier to digest in multiple initiatives. Third, each initiatives go live was not dependent on the other helping avoid the situation of one initiative's readiness for go live impacting the other. While there were benefits of this approach there were also several challenges that needed to be managed. First, several complex interfaces were required between the [redacted] system and legacy system. Second, when the second initiative integration was built additional regression testing was needed for the first initiative applications to ensure nothing was changed. Third, cross initiative resources need to stay focused on the next initiative and not get sidetracked into production support issues.

nskd

Proposed Transition Strategy: To take advantage of the benefits of the Phased by Application approach while ensuring we address the challenges, we propose that the first implementation of Financials/Procurement not overlap with the second implementation. Initiative 1, Financials/Procurement, will be implemented first following the Offeror's 5 phase/3 band methodology. Once Initiative 1 has gone live and entered Phase 05, then the next implementation will begin with Phase 01 for Initiative 2, HR/Payroll. The Financials/Procurement initiative will include temporary business processes to interact with the State's legacy human resources and payroll systems. The State must plan to staff the HR/Payroll project team during the financials/procurement project to design and support the temporary business processes. The HR/Payroll initiative will include implementation of new business processes for interaction between HR/Payroll and Financials/Procurement. This will necessitate additional testing for Initiative 1 that will need to be staffed by the State. The Offeror will include full-time Financials/Procurement staffing to support implementation of the new HR/Payroll business processes. Lastly, the proposed staffing plan ensures that there are dedicated production support resources allowing the Cross Initiative resources to focus on Initiative 2.

addressing the WSKS.

4. Educate and Train – Two key facets of our methodology serve to educate and train the State on the proposed systems: knowledge transfer between the Offeror project team and State project team and training of the end-user population.

educate + train - KT

Knowledge Transfer: Knowledge transfer (KT) is an ongoing task that is part of the Enterprise Readiness Band. It is expected to occur three different ways for State team members: (1) project task assignments, working side-by-side with Offeror consultants; (2) project relationships and interactions with Offeror coaches and other team members; and, (3) project team training typically delivered by the ERP software vendor. Using our PTK application, we measure KT at certain predefined junctures through a combination of State self-assessment and Offeror peer assessments. This measurement allows the State and Offeror to gauge progress towards KT goals and recognize and address any KT deficiencies.

Training: Training is part of Phase 04. The delivery of end-user training will be a combination of blended training course offerings. The percentage breakdown of blended courses is determined during curriculum sessions and is tailored to meet the State's unique business and geographic challenges. Types of training offered include: Instructor Led Classroom Delivery, Online Training, and Job Aids.

quality ass

5. Monitor Performance - The Quality Management Band involves ongoing processes to ensure project processes and outcomes best meet the needs of the State and the SOW.

Quality Management: Our Quality Manager is responsible for devising the project Quality Management Plan and overseeing its execution. The plan consists of Quality Control tasks during project activities as well as Quality Assurance tasks for future project activities and deliverables. Quality controls, such as checklists, templates, peer reviews, and so forth, are performed upfront by State and Offeror team members throughout all areas of the project team including functional, technical, and enterprise readiness. This enables a consistent standard of quality throughout the project. Quality Assurance involves assessment of project deliverables, work products, and other outcomes to analyze, assess, and adapt the quality of the project's outcomes. While Quality Control is ingrained in the initial completion of project tasks, Quality Assurance is typically performed following completion and sign-off of critical project tasks with the goal being improvement in quality of future project tasks.

SB

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk 1: Core Users are defined as those employees or key State experts who will be part of the project team to support the ERP Implementation effort. These Core Users will encounter competing priorities from the ongoing demands of their regular jobs as well as from the new duties and responsibilities inherent with the ERP Project.

Solution: To mitigate this risk, the Offeror is using our substantial statewide ERP implementation experience to recommend that Core Users should be moved from their legacy jobs to a representative job on the ERP Project. Specifically, the following changes should be made to minimize the need for Core Users to be required to participate in the ongoing, day-to-day demands of legacy operations:

- Develop a plan for post-implementation such that Core Users know upfront what their jobs will be after the implementation effort is complete.
- Backfill Core User positions with qualified individuals and hold the new employees accountable for legacy activities, duties and responsibilities.
- Move Core Users to a designated location established for ERP.
- Change Core User phone contact information or appropriate delegation message.
- Transfer cost centers to one that has been established for ERP.
- If possible, supplement Core Users with recent college graduates so knowledge is kept with more than one resource and there is opportunity to have them perform day-to-day tasks.

Risk 2: Ineffective Project Governance Structure and Processes

Solution: It is well known that all major statewide ERP projects must have a clear, effective, and functioning Project Governance structure and processes. At a minimum, the project governance structure and process should be documented as part of the Project Charter and include:

- Executive Sponsor Roles and Responsibilities
- Steering Committee Structure and Role
- Team Roles and Responsibilities
- Effective and Timely Decision Making Process
- A Fair and Effective Dispute Resolution Process
- Development of appropriate interagency agreements.

The Offeror has a vast amount of statewide ERP implementation experience and has a very pertinent example for governing these large State ERP implementations. A past client with two wholly different governance structures was implementing an ERP application within the same database. One governance structure and escalation process was more hierarchical in nature while the other was far more consensus driven. This led to different throughput times for decision making and also materially different rationale for decision making. Ultimately, a project governance structure was formed that these two very different organizations rolled up to one person that could make decisions for both organizations.

Risk 3: Self Service is a key success factor and a risk of failed user adoption if not properly deployed for the State and a major Change Management opportunity affecting both procurement and payment processing.

Solution: The Offeror will have a two pronged strategy to the change management opportunity for Self Services.

First, the Offeror will create a lessons learned chart during a one calendar month duration of the Project Planning time period from the State's implementation of the ASSETS system that consists of an inventory for lessons learned that will map to project plan tasks to ensure those lessons learned are performed during the project.

Second, the Offeror will use the proven methodology for change management issues using the business process flow below.

1. Clarifying the Self Service requirements in Requirement Verification Sessions. This initiates traceability and proper design of solutions to the requirements.
2. Compare the Self Service requirements vs. the delivered software to understand modification needs. These Fit Sessions incorporate agency users and continue knowledge transfer.
3. Most importantly, use the Self Service requirements to design the To-Be Business processes. An output of the business processes are change management opportunities. These change

management opportunities are then taken by the change management staff and socialized to the end users.

4. The socialization is done via the Business Process Implementation sessions which allow the agencies to view the To-Be business processes and also adjust their business processes accordingly ahead of the cycle testing.

Risk 4: Reluctant Agency Ownership

Solution: One of our large state customers had several agencies that believed the statewide ERP project would "never happen" especially after a long and protracted procurement process for software and services. Many agencies did not send appropriate representatives to participate in the system design and development effort. Other agencies did not bother to participate at all. Eventually, in the few short months prior to cutting over to the new application, these agencies realized that they had no staff trained and competent to use the new system. In addition, many requirements of these agencies were not addressed in the new ERP system due to lack of participation particularly during the Design Phase. Now committed to using the new system, the agencies lengthened and increased the painful transition process and slowed overall user adoption.

In the Offeror's many State ERP implementations, risk mitigation strategies have been learned to decrease the risk of reluctant agency involvement. The processes put in place to decrease this risk include:

- Collaborative Agency and Core User Requirement Verification and Fit Gap Sessions
- Dedicated Change Management Team with many years of State ERP experience
- Business Process Implementation Sessions that enable design decisions to be socialized to agencies
- Agency Scorecards that rate agency implementation effectiveness
- Organizational Alignment Workshops

Risk 5: The application phased approach will introduce temporary business processes and temporary interfaces between the Financials and Human Resources go-lives.

Solution: The Offeror very recently performed a Statewide government implementation of financials/procurement and human resources applications with this approach, as was requested by that State. The implementation timelines were overlapping, with the first application (HR/payroll) going live after approximately 2 years and the second application (financials/procurement) being released in waves beginning after approximately 2.5 years. This concurrent approach ultimately impacted the project effort and timelines because of the need to implement temporary business processes while also incorporating changes from the later financials/procurement implementation back into the earlier HR/payroll design. For example, the financials/procurement testing occurred after most HR/payroll testing had been completed and when issues with financials/procurement that impacted HR/payroll were found, there was less time for HR/payroll to address the issues prior to go-live.

The implementation of financials/procurement will include significant temporary business processes to interact with the State's legacy human resources and payroll systems. The State must plan to staff the HR/payroll project team during the financials/procurement project to design and support the temporary business processes. Additionally, the Offeror will provide full-time HR/payroll staffing to help coordinate the temporary business processes and also participate in design decisions that impact the future HR/payroll implementation.

The HR/payroll implementation will include implementation of new business processes for interaction between HR/payroll and financials/procurement. The State must plan to keep a significant staffed presence for financials/procurement throughout the HR/payroll implementation. The Offeror will include full-time financials/procurement staffing to support implementation of the new HR/payroll business processes. It is critical to note that both the State and Offeror staff assigned to participate in HR/payroll from a financials/procurement perspective are over, above, and separate from any staff assigned to production support for financials/procurement.

Risk 6– Multiple system implementers add significant complexity to ERP project governance. The Offeror has participated in a statewide ERP effort where project governance was comprised due to multiple system implementers that were joined together to plan, develop and deliver the ERP solution. Furthermore, baseline risks that are inherent in complex ERP implementations are significantly magnified

approach and the Offeror's experience.

Experience and Challenges of the Phased by Application: The Offeror very recently performed a Statewide government implementation of financials/procurement and human resources applications using the Phased by Application approach where the HR/Payroll and Financials/Procurement initiatives had minimal overlap. Utilizing this approach was beneficial in several ways to our client. First, cross initiative resources (including PMO, Technical, Organizational Readiness, Training, etc.) were not overburdened with the complexity and work of two initiatives going live at the same time. Second, while the total change to the organization was the same it was easier to digest in multiple initiatives. Third, each initiatives go live was not dependent on the other helping avoid the situation of one initiative's readiness for go live impacting the other. While there were benefits of this approach there were also several challenges that needed to be managed. First, several complex interfaces were required between the [REDACTED] system and legacy system. Second, when the second initiative integration was built additional regression testing was needed for the first initiative applications to ensure nothing was changed. Third, cross initiative resources need to stay focused on the next initiative and not get sidetracked into production support issues.

good

Proposed Transition Strategy: To take advantage of the benefits of the Phased by Application approach while ensuring we address the challenges, we propose that the first implementation of Financials/Procurement not overlap with the second implementation. Initiative 1, Financials/Procurement, will be implemented first following the Offeror's 5 phase/3 band methodology. Once Initiative 1 has gone live and entered Phase 05, then the next implementation will begin with Phase 01 for Initiative 2, HR/Payroll. The Financials/Procurement initiative will include temporary business processes to interact with the State's legacy human resources and payroll systems. The State must plan to staff the HR/Payroll project team during the financials/procurement project to design and support the temporary business processes. The HR/Payroll initiative will include implementation of new business processes for interaction between HR/Payroll and Financials/Procurement. This will necessitate additional testing for Initiative 1 that will need to be staffed by the State. The Offeror will include full-time Financials/Procurement staffing to support implementation of the new HR/Payroll business processes. Lastly, the proposed staffing plan ensures that there are dedicated production support resources allowing the Cross Initiative resources to focus on Initiative 2.

4. Educate and Train – Two key facets of our methodology serve to educate and train the State on the proposed systems: knowledge transfer between the Offeror project team and State project team and training of the end-user population.

Knowledge Transfer: Knowledge transfer (KT) is an ongoing task that is part of the Enterprise Readiness Band. It is expected to occur three different ways for State team members: (1) project task assignments, working side-by-side with Offeror consultants; (2) project relationships and interactions with Offeror coaches and other team members; and, (3) project team training typically delivered by the ERP software vendor. Using our PTK application, we measure KT at certain predefined junctures through a combination of State self-assessment and Offeror peer assessments. This measurement allows the State and Offeror to gauge progress towards KT goals and recognize and address any KT deficiencies.

Training: Training is part of Phase 04. The delivery of end-user training will be a combination of blended training course offerings. The percentage breakdown of blended courses is determined during curriculum sessions and is tailored to meet the State's unique business and geographic challenges. Types of training offered include: Instructor Led Classroom Delivery, Online Training, and Job Aids.

5. Monitor Performance - The Quality Management Band involves ongoing processes to ensure project processes and outcomes best meet the needs of the State and the SOW.

Quality Management: Our Quality Manager is responsible for devising the project Quality Management Plan and overseeing its execution. The plan consists of Quality Control tasks during project activities as well as Quality Assurance tasks for future project activities and deliverables. Quality controls, such as checklists, templates, peer reviews, and so forth, are performed upfront by State and Offeror team members throughout all areas of the project team including functional, technical, and enterprise readiness. This enables a consistent standard of quality throughout the project. Quality Assurance involves assessment of project deliverables, work products, and other outcomes to analyze, assess, and adapt the quality of the project's outcomes. While Quality Control is ingrained in the initial completion of project tasks, Quality Assurance is typically performed following completion and sign-off of critical project tasks with the goal being improvement in quality of future project tasks.

DS

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).

Zhan

DS

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk 1: Core Users are defined as those employees or key State experts who will be part of the project team to support the ERP Implementation effort. These Core Users will encounter competing priorities from the ongoing demands of their regular jobs as well as from the new duties and responsibilities inherent with the ERP Project.

Solution: To mitigate this risk, the Offeror is using our substantial statewide ERP implementation experience to recommend that Core Users should be moved from their legacy jobs to a representative job on the ERP Project. Specifically, the following changes should be made to minimize the need for Core Users to be required to participate in the ongoing, day-to-day demands of legacy operations:

- Develop a plan for post-implementation such that Core Users know upfront what their jobs will be after the implementation effort is complete.
- Backfill Core User positions with qualified individuals and hold the new employees accountable for legacy activities, duties and responsibilities.
- Move Core Users to a designated location established for ERP.
- Change Core User phone contact information or appropriate delegation message.
- Transfer cost centers to one that has been established for ERP.
- If possible, supplement Core Users with recent college graduates so knowledge is kept with more than one resource and there is opportunity to have them perform day-to-day tasks.

Recommendation

Risk 2: Ineffective Project Governance Structure and Processes

Solution: It is well known that all major statewide ERP projects must have a clear, effective, and functioning Project Governance structure and processes. At a minimum, the project governance structure and process should be documented as part of the Project Charter and include:

- Executive Sponsor Roles and Responsibilities
- Steering Committee Structure and Role
- Team Roles and Responsibilities
- Effective and Timely Decision Making Process
- A Fair and Effective Dispute Resolution Process
- Development of appropriate interagency agreements.

The Offeror has a vast amount of statewide ERP implementation experience and has a very pertinent example for governing these large State ERP implementations. A past client with two wholly different governance structures was implementing an ERP application within the same database. One governance structure and escalation process was more hierarchical in nature while the other was far more consensus driven. This led to different throughput times for decision making and also materially different rationale for decision making. Ultimately, a project governance structure was formed that these two very different organizations rolled up to one person that could make decisions for both organizations.

Risk 3: Self Service is a key success factor and a risk of failed user adoption if not properly deployed for the State and a major Change Management opportunity affecting both procurement and payment processing.

Solution: The Offeror will have a two pronged strategy to the change management opportunity for Self Services.

First, the Offeror will create a lessons learned chart during a one calendar month duration of the Project Planning time period from the State's implementation of the ASSETS system that consists of an inventory for lessons learned that will map to project plan tasks to ensure those lessons learned are performed during the project.

Second, the Offeror will use the proven methodology for change management issues using the business process flow below.

1. Clarifying the Self Service requirements in Requirement Verification Sessions. This initiates traceability and proper design of solutions to the requirements.
2. Compare the Self Service requirements vs. the delivered software to understand modification needs. These Fit Sessions incorporate agency users and continue knowledge transfer.
3. Most importantly, use the Self Service requirements to design the To-Be Business processes. An output of the business processes are change management opportunities. These change

DS

management opportunities are then taken by the change management staff and socialized to the end users.

4. The socialization is done via the Business Process Implementation sessions which allow the agencies to view the To-Be business processes and also adjust their business processes accordingly ahead of the cycle testing.

Risk 4: Reluctant Agency Ownership

Solution: One of our large state customers had several agencies that believed the statewide ERP project would "never happen" especially after a long and protracted procurement process for software and services. Many agencies did not send appropriate representatives to participate in the system design and development effort. Other agencies did not bother to participate at all. Eventually, in the few short months prior to cutting over to the new application, these agencies realized that they had no staff trained and competent to use the new system. In addition, many requirements of these agencies were not addressed in the new ERP system due to lack of participation particularly during the Design Phase. Now committed to using the new system, the agencies lengthened and increased the painful transition process and slowed overall user adoption.

In the Offeror's many State ERP implementations, risk mitigation strategies have been learned to decrease the risk of reluctant agency involvement. The processes put in place to decrease this risk include:

- Collaborative Agency and Core User Requirement Verification and Fit Gap Sessions
- Dedicated Change Management Team with many years of State ERP experience
- Business Process Implementation Sessions that enable design decisions to be socialized to agencies
- Agency Scorecards that rate agency implementation effectiveness
- Organizational Alignment Workshops

Risk 5: The application phased approach will introduce temporary business processes and temporary interfaces between the Financials and Human Resources go-lives.

Solution: The Offeror very recently performed a Statewide government implementation of financials/procurement and human resources applications with this approach, as was requested by that State. The implementation timelines were overlapping, with the first application (HR/payroll) going live after approximately 2 years and the second application (financials/procurement) being released in waves beginning after approximately 2.5 years. This concurrent approach ultimately impacted the project effort and timelines because of the need to implement temporary business processes while also incorporating changes from the later financials/procurement implementation back into the earlier HR/payroll design. For example, the financials/procurement testing occurred after most HR/payroll testing had been completed and when issues with financials/procurement that impacted HR/payroll were found, there was less time for HR/payroll to address the issues prior to go-live.

good risk 17

The implementation of financials/procurement will include significant temporary business processes to interact with the State's legacy human resources and payroll systems. The State must plan to staff the HR/payroll project team during the financials/procurement project to design and support the temporary business processes. Additionally, the Offeror will provide full-time HR/payroll staffing to help coordinate the temporary business processes and also participate in design decisions that impact the future HR/payroll implementation.

The HR/payroll implementation will include implementation of new business processes for interaction between HR/payroll and financials/procurement. The State must plan to keep a significant staffed presence for financials/procurement throughout the HR/payroll implementation. The Offeror will include full-time financials/procurement staffing to support implementation of the new HR/payroll business processes. It is critical to note that both the State and Offeror staff assigned to participate in HR/payroll from a financials/procurement perspective are over, above, and separate from any staff assigned to production support for financials/procurement.

Risk 6- Multiple system implementers add significant complexity to ERP project governance. The Offeror has participated in a statewide ERP effort where project governance was comprised due to multiple system implementers that were joined together to plan, develop and deliver the ERP solution. Furthermore, baseline risks that are inherent in complex ERP implementations are significantly magnified

DS

EXHIBIT C - VALUE ADDED OPTIONS

Identify any associated value added options that may benefit the State of Alaska. Outline additional product features and/or implementation services you may provide. All value added options must include an associated cost. **DO NOT** include value added options in your cost proposal. Prior to award, the State of Alaska will determine if the value added items will be accepted or rejected. Add additional items as necessary.

The value added options must include those for both the Software Product and System Implementer Offerors in the same response form.

Please note that your value added options response cannot exceed two pages (excluding these instructions).

Blah

DS

forth. The tool also tracks detailed documentation supporting the actual development/programming effort, such as affected object inventory references and reusable procedures specifications. Finally, the tool tracks specific unit test scenarios, including expected results, data values, and actual results.

Validation: The PTK includes powerful tools for planning, executing, and tracking System Test cycles. The tool enables planning of test cycles through development of test scripts and test scenarios. For efficiency, these scripts and scenarios can be developed once but used and reused in multiple cycles of testing, including System Test and Acceptance Test. Test execution results for each script and scenario are entered directly into the PTK during testing. This allows standardization of test results, early identification of result trends, and the most up-to-date status reporting for management.

Cost: \$25,000 for Remote Hosting

Item 3: Third Party Solutions

Within the Exhibit F - Software Functionality and Technical Requirements there are several requirements that could be met by third party solutions. The Offeror has not provided costs in our core offer, but present them here as value added solutions.

- Offeror software will meet the barcoding requirements (requirement 1026, 1027, 1074, and 4103). The software will provide functionality beyond that specified in the RFP, so it is appropriate to list here in the value add section:
 - Cost: Asset Advantage Base Application, \$10,000 (for use with the PI portion of the application)
 - 1-10 Licensed Users w/Hardware - \$4,700 each (w/o terminals @ \$2,500 each)
 - 11+ Licensed Users w/Hardware - \$3,200 each (w/o terminals @ \$1,000 each)
 - Services (Modifications, Configuration & Training and travel), \$41,000
 - Scanners for PC's, \$500 each and Pre-printed Labels, \$2,000 for 10,000
- Offeror service provides a subscription based service to meet the clean address requirement 1740 and 2050.
 - Cost: \$5695 per year for up to 120K address verifications.
- Offeror software will meet the retail cashiering requirements (requirement 1673-1682). The software will provide functionality beyond that specified in the RFP, so it is appropriate to list here in the value add section:
 - Cost: License = \$100k based on 25 registers
 - Implementation = 400k, unlimited registers. Initial rollout and creation of golden CD which can be loaded on each register after pilot.

if required then why here?

well that is enlightening

Item 4: ERP Recruiting Module

Implement the fully integrated recruiting module for job openings, recruiting and new hires.

Cost: Software Cost: Estimate \$250,000

Item 5: ERP - Policy Automation Module

Policy automation solution enables government agencies throughout the world to effectively deliver services and fairly and consistently determine legislated and policy obligations. The fundamental objective of our policy solution is to enable much greater direct participation by policy experts in the development of eligibility systems by directly transforming regulations, legislation, and other policy documents into executable business rules.

Cost: TBD**

Item 6: Governance, Risk and Compliance Module

Without the ability to coordinate and consolidate governance, risk, and compliance (GRC) activities, organizations cannot rise to calls for greater accountability, nor can they evaluate and manage potential threats to the organization, all the while keeping resources and costs in check.

Cost: TBD**

Item 7: Master Data Management Module

Many organizations still don't have a true view of their citizen and suppliers, much less their inventory and financials. Although they invest in new, sophisticated enterprise applications to handle business processes, the data those systems generate is not centrally managed. Master Data Management solutions are designed to consolidate, cleanse, and enrich key business data from across the enterprise, and synchronize it with all applications, business processes, and analytical tools.

COST: TBD** NOTE: MODULE PRICING WILL BE BASED ON NUMEROUS FOOTPRINT FACTORS

?
6

?

DS

TABLE D - 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	14,150	20,215
2. Project status reports	7,075	10,107
3. Weekly risk reports	7,075	10,107
4. Satisfaction surveys	2,830	4,043
5. System configuration reports	7,075	10,107
6. Business process modification recommendations	9,905	14,150
7. Configured software ready for test	7,075	10,107
8. Accepted workflows	7,075	10,107
9. Hardware specification (applicable to licensed solution)	2,830	4,043
10. Application architecture documentation	2,830	4,043
11. Installation certification document	4,250	4,043
12. Data conversion plan	7,075	10,107
13. Validated migrated data	7,075	10,107
14. Reports	2,830	4,043
15. Interface specifications	2,830	4,043
16. Tested interfaces	4,250	10,107
17. Test plan	7,075	10,107
18. Volume/stress testing report	7,075	10,107
19. Training plan	4,250	6,064
20. Training materials	4,245	6,064
21. Training	4,245	6,064
22. Knowledge transfer plan and activity	2,830	4,043
23. Go-live and stabilization plan	2,830	4,043
24. Technical operations manual	2,830	4,043
25. Business user manual	2,830	4,043
26. Configured and licensed software in productive use	2,830	4,043
27. Stabilization services	2,830	4,043

140,100

202,143

342.2
DS

PROJECT WORK PLAN

1. **Offeror's Methodology** - Our methodology is comprised of five phases of discrete activities and three bands of continual activities. A high-level overview of the methodology is given below, followed by references to each of the key activities within the methodology that specifically manage scope, schedule, and the implementation.

Phases: Phases occur at defined junctures in the project lifecycle. The phases are as follows:

01 - Initiation – Plan the project and create its foundation

02 - Design – Design future State business processes to meet the State's functional requirements

03 - Development – Implement the system design decisions from the Design Phase

04 - Validation – Test the system and take it into production

05 - Post-Implementation – Support the live production system

Bands: Bands are made up of continual tasks that occur throughout the project lifecycle as follows:

Project Management – Direct, monitor, and control the project throughout the implementation lifecycle

Quality Management – Assure that project outcomes, documents, and procedures best meet the needs of the State and the project

Enterprise Readiness – Assure that the State's organization is ready and able to adopt the new business processes

Managing Project Scope: The primary mechanism for managing project scope is the agreed upon Statement of Work (SOW) between the State and the Offeror. By working with the State upfront to put in place a comprehensive and realistic SOW, we have a solid scope that drives ongoing scope management throughout the project. Scope Management is part of our Project Management Band and happens continually throughout the project lifecycle. The goals of Scope Management are twofold:

A. Ensure that the SOW scope is fully met through project activities. **B.** Ensure that SOW scope is not exceeded, in other words: prevent scope creep. A primary ongoing task to manage scope is the setting of deliverable expectations for each SOW deliverable via a Deliverable Expectation Document (DED). Each DED documents the State's and the Offeror's expectations for a deliverable before work begins. By documenting and reinforcing the agreed-to scope upfront, the DED ensures the deliverable meets the SOW and helps to mitigate scope creep.

Managing Project Schedule: During the Initiation Phase, we take the lead on defining the Baseline Project Work Plan. As specified by the State, this plan will be built using Microsoft Project 2003. A key tool used in managing this schedule is Microsoft Project Server 2007. We will import the initial MS Project 2003 plan into our MS Project Server 2007 and rollout the usage of the web-based tool to most State and Offeror team members, allowing them to view and update project task details such as percentage complete. By decentralizing project plan maintenance in this manner, we ensure the most up to date information is included in the project schedule. We have successfully used this approach on prior Statewide ERP implementations. We have seen that having the continually updated information allows State and Offeror project management to identify potential schedule and plan issues early and put in place mitigation steps to keep the project schedule on track.

Managing Project Implementation: Managing the implementation as a whole is led by the Offeror Project Manager and other Offeror management team members. The methodology described above is used by our project management team to guide the implementation. The methodology is enhanced by our robust Proprietary Tool Kit (PTK) application, which is a specialized tool, built on a [REDACTED] platform and used to perform, monitor, and control key project tasks. State and Offeror team members will use this application to document key project tasks including Requirements Management, Issues Management, System Design, and Integration/System Testing. One of the key benefits of this application is the project data is stored in a database and can easily be summarized and reported on, providing management with timely data to enable informed management decisions. For example, our prior State government clients were able use the PTK to access on-demand reports of real-time System Test execution data at any time during testing. These reports include status of test scenarios, summarized by module area or project-wide, including planned and actual percentage completion and failure rates. Other PTK testing reports link failed scenarios to documented issues to enable monitoring and controlling of the issue resolution and retesting processes.

2. Offeror's Approach to:

System Initialization: The Offeror will build environments in accordance with the delivered software vendor installation instructions. Environments are built with the selected application and latest tools

release. Generally, all maintenance packs available for the application release will be installed.

System Installation: The baseline technical architecture is installed during Phase 01 -- Initiation of our methodology. As the implementation progresses, the Offeror is responsible for installing the various environments necessary to support project activities including: system design, development, system testing, and go-live. During the development phase, the Gold environment, the most critical environment, is installed. The Gold instance contains the final version of configuration and development and is used for initiating each system test cycle and is the production environment used for go-live.

Business Process Design/Reengineering: Business process design, or system design, occurs in Phase 02, but is the central and essential step to everything that occurs during the implementation. Led by the Offeror, the system design involves a collaborative approach to design and document the State's future business processes. A key aspect of system design is making a final determination of how State business practices are adjusted to reflect the business processes enabled by the delivered ERP application. Produced from our PTK application, the system design document deliverable breaks out each business process into each key step. For each business process, the design outlines the future business process steps and their relationships to key business roles, development, and the ERP software. This design drives the configuration, development, and testing that occurs later in the project.

System Configuration: System Configuration is an important step in Phase 03 of our methodology. Offeror resources are accountable for building a configuration into a Gold environment after system design. It is important for State resources to assist because it enables knowledge transfer, on-the-job training, and reduced support structure post go-live. Offeror provides a configuration tool for tracking completeness, documenting decisions, and managerial reporting.

System Tailoring: Occurring in Phase 03, tailoring of the software involves detailed design, development, and unit testing of targeted enhancements to the delivered software functionality to meet the State's requirements. The detailed design of enhancements is led by the Offeror functional team with full participation from the State functional team and specifies the needed functionality. Development is performed by the Offeror technical team to create the code and pages designed by the functional team. Unit testing is led by the Offeror functional team with participation from the State functional team and consists of testing of targeted scenarios to ensure the enhancement meets the detailed design specification. Our PTK application tool is used to track documentation and status around detailed design, development, and unit testing as described above in Managing Project Implementation.

Interface Design and Development: Occurring in Phase 03, interface design and development follows the same steps as the enhancement steps described under System Tailoring: detailed design, development, and unit testing. The detailed design includes a full file layout that defines calculation logic, transformation rules, source/target fields, valid field values, field lengths, etc.

Data Conversion: Also, a Phase 03 activity, data conversion, is grouped into individual development items that each follow the same steps as the enhancement steps described under System Tailoring: detailed design, development, and unit testing. The detailed design process involves conversion mapping that is led by the Offeror with contribution from State functional and technical experts. The output of conversion mapping is a full conversion map used for developing both the State's extracts from the legacy systems and the Offeror's load processes into the ERP.

Testing: System testing is essential to Phase 04 -- Validation. It involves using the ERP system to test the designed business processes, including State configuration, enhancements, interfaces, and conversion data. In our iterative testing approach, we plan three primary cycles of testing: integration, system, and user acceptance. Integration involves the most critical business processes, system involves the full breadth of business processes, and user acceptance involves user-affecting business processes.

Post-Implementation Stabilization: During Phases 03 and 04, the Offeror will lead the development of a production support plan. Post-Implementation support and stabilization involves putting the production support plan into action when each phase of the ERP system is released. During the support period, application support is a shared responsibility between State and Offeror project staff. State project staff will be the primary point of contact for end users of the ERP, while the Offeror performs an active role in supporting all other support activities including issue resolution. This enables State staff to ready themselves for independent long-term production support of the application after Offeror support ends.

3. **Transition -** The State has indicated a strong preference for a phased implementation with financials/procurement first followed by HR/ Payroll. The Offeror refers to this approach as a Phased by Application approach and the following sections describe this benefits and challenges of this

BL

approach and the Offeror's experience.

Experience and Challenges of the Phased by Application: The Offeror very recently performed a Statewide government implementation of financials/procurement and human resources applications using the Phased by Application approach where the HR/Payroll and Financials/Procurement initiatives had minimal overlap. Utilizing this approach was beneficial in several ways to our client. First, cross initiative resources (including PMO, Technical, Organizational Readiness, Training, etc.) were not overburdened with the complexity and work of two initiatives going live at the same time. Second, while the total change to the organization was the same it was easier to digest in multiple initiatives. Third, each initiatives go live was not dependent on the other helping avoid the situation of one initiative's readiness for go live impacting the other. While there were benefits of this approach there were also several challenges that needed to be managed. First, several complex interfaces were required between the [REDACTED] system and legacy system. Second, when the second initiative integration was built additional regression testing was needed for the first initiative applications to ensure nothing was changed. Third, cross initiative resources need to stay focused on the next initiative and not get sidetracked into production support issues.

Good examples

Proposed Transition Strategy: To take advantage of the benefits of the Phased by Application approach while ensuring we address the challenges, we propose that the first implementation of Financials/Procurement not overlap with the second implementation. Initiative 1, Financials/Procurement, will be implemented first following the Offeror's 5 phase/3 band methodology. Once Initiative 1 has gone live and entered Phase 05, then the next implementation will begin with Phase 01 for Initiative 2, HR/Payroll. The Financials/Procurement initiative will include temporary business processes to interact with the State's legacy human resources and payroll systems. The State must plan to staff the HR/Payroll project team during the financials/procurement project to design and support the temporary business processes. The HR/Payroll initiative will include implementation of new business processes for interaction between HR/Payroll and Financials/Procurement. This will necessitate additional testing for Initiative 1 that will need to be staffed by the State. The Offeror will include full-time Financials/Procurement staffing to support implementation of the new HR/Payroll business processes. Lastly, the proposed staffing plan ensures that there are dedicated production support resources allowing the Cross Initiative resources to focus on Initiative 2.

4. Educate and Train – Two key facets of our methodology serve to educate and train the State on the proposed systems: knowledge transfer between the Offeror project team and State project team and training of the end-user population.

Knowledge Transfer: Knowledge transfer (KT) is an ongoing task that is part of the Enterprise Readiness Band. It is expected to occur three different ways for State team members: (1) project task assignments, working side-by-side with Offeror consultants; (2) project relationships and interactions with Offeror coaches and other team members; and, (3) project team training typically delivered by the ERP software vendor. Using our PTK application, we measure KT at certain predefined junctures through a combination of State self-assessment and Offeror peer assessments. This measurement allows the State and Offeror to gauge progress towards KT goals and recognize and address any KT deficiencies.

Training: Training is part of Phase 04. The delivery of end-user training will be a combination of blended training course offerings. The percentage breakdown of blended courses is determined during curriculum sessions and is tailored to meet the State's unique business and geographic challenges. Types of training offered include: Instructor Led Classroom Delivery, Online Training, and Job Aids.

5. Monitor Performance - The Quality Management Band involves ongoing processes to ensure project processes and outcomes best meet the needs of the State and the SOW.

Quality Management: Our Quality Manager is responsible for devising the project Quality Management Plan and overseeing its execution. The plan consists of Quality Control tasks during project activities as well as Quality Assurance tasks for future project activities and deliverables. Quality controls, such as checklists, templates, peer reviews, and so forth, are performed upfront by State and Offeror team members throughout all areas of the project team including functional, technical, and enterprise readiness. This enables a consistent standard of quality throughout the project. Quality Assurance involves assessment of project deliverables, work products, and other outcomes to analyze, assess, and adapt the quality of the project's outcomes. While Quality Control is ingrained in the initial completion of project tasks, Quality Assurance is typically performed following completion and sign-off of critical project tasks with the goal being improvement in quality of future project tasks.

BL

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk 1: Core Users are defined as those employees or key State experts who will be part of the project team to support the ERP Implementation effort. These Core Users will encounter competing priorities from the ongoing demands of their regular jobs as well as from the new duties and responsibilities inherent with the ERP Project.

Solution: To mitigate this risk, the Offeror is using our substantial statewide ERP implementation experience to recommend that Core Users should be moved from their legacy jobs to a representative job on the ERP Project. Specifically, the following changes should be made to minimize the need for Core Users to be required to participate in the ongoing, day-to-day demands of legacy operations:

- Develop a plan for post-implementation such that Core Users know upfront what their jobs will be after the implementation effort is complete.
- Backfill Core User positions with qualified individuals and hold the new employees accountable for legacy activities, duties and responsibilities.
- Move Core Users to a designated location established for ERP.
- Change Core User phone contact information or appropriate delegation message.
- Transfer cost centers to one that has been established for ERP.
- If possible, supplement Core Users with recent college graduates so knowledge is kept with more than one resource and there is opportunity to have them perform day-to-day tasks.

Risk 2: Ineffective Project Governance Structure and Processes

Solution: It is well known that all major statewide ERP projects must have a clear, effective, and functioning Project Governance structure and processes. At a minimum, the project governance structure and process should be documented as part of the Project Charter and include:

- Executive Sponsor Roles and Responsibilities
- Steering Committee Structure and Role
- Team Roles and Responsibilities
- Effective and Timely Decision Making Process
- A Fair and Effective Dispute Resolution Process
- Development of appropriate interagency agreements.

The Offeror has a vast amount of statewide ERP implementation experience and has a very pertinent example for governing these large State ERP implementations. A past client with two wholly different governance structures was implementing an ERP application within the same database. One governance structure and escalation process was more hierarchical in nature while the other was far more consensus driven. This led to different throughput times for decision making and also materially different rationale for decision making. Ultimately, a project governance structure was formed that these two very different organizations rolled up to one person that could make decisions for both organizations.

Risk 3: Self Service is a key success factor and a risk of failed user adoption if not properly deployed for the State and a major Change Management opportunity affecting both procurement and payment processing.

Solution: The Offeror will have a two pronged strategy to the change management opportunity for Self Services.

First, the Offeror will create a lessons learned chart during a one calendar month duration of the Project Planning time period from the State's implementation of the ASSETS system that consists of an inventory for lessons learned that will map to project plan tasks to ensure those lessons learned are performed during the project.

Second, the Offeror will use the proven methodology for change management issues using the business process flow below.

1. Clarifying the Self Service requirements in Requirement Verification Sessions. This initiates traceability and proper design of solutions to the requirements.
2. Compare the Self Service requirements vs. the delivered software to understand modification needs. These Fit Sessions incorporate agency users and continue knowledge transfer.
3. Most importantly, use the Self Service requirements to design the To-Be Business processes. An output of the business processes are change management opportunities. These change

BL

VALUE ADDED

Item 1: Item Maintenance

Faced with the slow, manual process of updating the information contained in their enterprise application systems, the Offeror's past statewide client needed a solution that would allow them to manage over 100,000 items, integrate them with their inventory system, and build upon existing supplier catalogs. Adding or updating the item master or procurement attribute information would require a largely manual process that would put an immense strain on resource staffing levels. Additionally, the slow process of updating these items leads to inconsistent approaches as managers attempt to short-cut the tremendous efforts involved.

Typical item maintenance requires manually extracting, reviewing, and correcting item data. Staff must be highly-trained and vigilant, with specialized skills for using tools like Microsoft Access databases or Microsoft Excel. Most organizations don't have enough of these specialty personnel, and the Offeror's past client is no different.

Generally, the solution for addressing these large sets of data is a combination of conversion programs using staff to extract, review, update, reload, and validate the item data. While this process is less-intensive than a purely manual update, it is still time-consuming and prone to error.

The Offeror, who worked with the past client on the statewide ERP project, created and implemented the Content Tool Solution, an integrated item-maintenance solution to address their specific needs. The Content Tool Solution is built on a comprehensive methodology that aggregates large sets of item data so they can be manipulated by an end-user, without assistance from technical resources. The data managers are now able to focus on their main priorities, high-visibility items, or specific sets of data, while re-working the attributes immediately, or to continually improve data accuracy and procurement controls as needed.

The fully-integrated Content Tool Solution includes the following features:

- Allows for efficient mass conversion and updating of category tables, tree manager, enabling management of electronic vendor catalogs.
- Allows for the creation of Catalog Requests to send to vendors or internal agencies for the purpose of electronic catalog loading and updates with built-in approvals, audit trails, reporting and queries.
- Provides over 200 validation checks against master tables and other configured logic.
- Requires no technical assistance, yet incorporates more than 4,000 fields, 300 tables, and utilizes the ERP software's delivered Application Security.

The Content Tool Solution enables procurement and inventory managers to have total control over each item's data in an easy-to-use, powerful, fully-integrated module. Users can automatically sort, filter, and process over 50,000 items in a matter of seconds or minutes, a process that done manually could easily take weeks or months. The Offeror's past client now has the ability to stage and update items based on any field values, such as category code, family code, buyer, vendor, description, manufacturer, or inspection code.

Cost: \$30,000

Item 2: Offeror's Methodology Toolkit

The Offeror's Proprietary Toolkit (PTK) Application is a custom and proprietary, value-added toolset built on an ERP application platform and hosted by the Offeror's Data Center. The tool includes features to support the Offeror's work in implementing ERP systems, including design, development, and validation (testing). This tool promotes efficiency, standardization, and transparency across the project.

Design: The PTK provides a central tracking system to enable the best and most efficient design of the State's business processes. For instance, the tool will track each of the State's software requirements from the point of identification, through the Fit Analysis process, into the System Design of business processes, and finally into System Testing of the designed business processes. Using the powerful ERP Application reporting and query tools, the requirements can be easily analyzed at critical project juncture to see where they stand against planned targets and metrics. This tool helps ensure that the State's business processes meet each and every of its requirements.

Development: The PTK provides a central tool for documentation of detailed design, development, and unit testing of all development items (also known as development requests (DRs) throughout the project lifecycle. Types of DRs contained within the tool include conversions, interfaces, reports, workflows, and enhancements. The tool houses detailed design information for each DR in a standardized format, including business logic, conversion layouts, user interface (page) designs, security specifications, and so

BL

Position	Number of years with proposed product	Key staff? (Y/N)
Conversion Developer HCM	3,292	0
Interface Developer (FIN)	3,264	1,632
Interface Developer (HCM)	3,091	1,545
Customizations Developer (FIN)	3,264	1,632
Customizations Developer (FIN)	2,944	0
Customizations Developer (HCM)	3,091	1,545
Customizations Developer (HCM)	2,771	0
Workflow/Reports Developer (FIN)	52	260
Workflow/Reports Developer (FIN)	520	260

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

(Handwritten mark)

BL