

Attribute	Description	Rating Scale	Business Requirements
<b>Cost Variability</b>	Cost variability based on volume increases/decreases; fixed/total cost ratio.	1 High fixed cost component; non-linear cost-volume increments/decrements	The business has signaled that it has very little capital to invest in IT and cannot afford to build fixed capacity in excess of current and future demand.
		2 Costs unresponsive to demand decrements; high costs associated with demand increases	
		3 Costs unresponsive to demand decrements	
		4 Small investments required with little or no sunk costs; costs responsive to volumes changes	
		5 "Pay as you go"; linear cost increments/decrements based on volumes	
<b>Management Risks</b>	Likelihood that the alternative will be able to avoid failure through the design and implementation of adequate risk mitigation processes. Ability to consistently deliver at levels meeting requirements, avoiding potential management failures or	1 High probability of failure as a result of unmitigatable risks or poor management	Interviews point to the Well-Managed core value. Operational control and security are considered essential. While it is acknowledged that we do not have great experience with managing outsourcers, it is generally believed that it's easier to address this deficiency than it is to continuously maintain Systems Operations management at this level.
		2 Sub-optimal mitigation possibilities create moderate risk of failure	
		3 Adequate skills and maturity to manage operational risk associated with delivery model; meets minimum standard for all internal and external requirements	
		4 Low probability of failure through extensive risk mitigation program	
		5 Low probability of failure due to demonstrated capabilities, maturity of management processes, and strong risk management	
<b>New System Flexibility</b>	Capability to support changing business requirements and new systems over time without significant business disruption or capital investment.	1 Changes to Systems Operations volumes require large investments and lengthy lead times, thereby precluding business change	High level of concern over capital investment requirements. Further, the business has no interest in increasing time-to-results while Systems Operations gets ready for ongoing operations. The business has explicitly stated that it will pay more to avoid either or both of these problems.
		2 Changes to Systems Operations slow down but do not preclude business changes	
		3 With sufficient investment, Systems Operations changes can be made within Solutions Delivery timeframes	
		4 Able to adjust to new system requirements within required timeframe and while reducing total level of capital required	
		5 Systems Operations is never an obstacle to business change	
<b>Performance</b>	Ability to meet requirements (feature, function, performance) at stated performance levels pertaining to reliability, throughput, availability, response time, and other commitments. Disaster recovery contingencies in	1 Systems and processes are not available or are running significantly below requirements >10% of the time	Based on the interviews, the business values enhanced performance only to the extent that unit costs remain relatively fixed. Expectation is for disaster recovery structure to be in place and adequate.
		2 High availability for most important systems	
		3 High availability (>98%) for all systems	
		4 Very high availability (>99%) for mission critical systems; high availability for all others	
		5 6-sigma -- Fault tolerant, fail-safe	
<b>Service Unit Costs</b>	Total cost of operation and maintenance unitized by service unit or other relevant measure.	1 >10% above cost trajectory	Based on the interviews, Systems Operations costs do not appear to be a problem at this time. Further, the business recognizes some level of trade-off between Solutions Delivery time-to-results and Systems Operations costs, and they're willing to pay more for quicker results. Cheaper is better, but only for a given level of service.
		2 5-10% above cost trajectory	
		3 Flat - cost efficiencies will balance out cost increases	
		4 5-10% below cost trajectory	
		5 >10% below cost trajectory	
<b>Solutions Delivery Costs</b>	Total cost of development, integration, and implementation	1 >20% above estimated costs	Cheaper is better. Perception is that current delivery costs could be reduced by minimizing "uniqueness" factors, architectural complexity, and adequate funding.
		2 10-20% above estimated costs	
		3 Within 10% of estimated costs	
		4 10-20% below estimated costs	
		5 >20% below estimated costs	
<b>Solutions Delivery Efficacy</b>	Will the system deliver the required functionality; how easy is it to change in response to changes in business requirements; how sustainable is it?	1 Major short-term functionality gaps; hard to sustain functionality without large, frequent investments	Current direction is toward COTS packages with hooks for a few custom functions.
		2 Meets most known requirements; deficiencies not deemed major; sustainability in doubt	
		3 Meets most known requirements; deficiencies not deemed major	
		4 Meets all known functionality requirements	
		5 Meets all known functionality requirements; sustainability ensured by explicit processes and commitments	
<b>Speed-to-Results</b>	How long it takes for systems solutions (i.e., new systems or major enhancements) to yield significant business results. Measured from decision to implementation.	1 Extended delivery timeframes (>2 years); frequent AD abandonment prior to implementation	Undoubtedly the most important factor to the business and the greatest source of current dissatisfaction.
		2 "Average" solutions in 18-24 months	
		3 "Average" solutions in 9-18 months	
		4 "Average" solutions in 3-9 months	
		5 World Class; "Average" solutions delivered in < 3 months	

<b>Career Enhancement</b>	Opportunities for promotion, job enrichment/expansion, synergistic work environment, etc.	1	Job stagnation ultimately resulting in job elimination	Our Core Values dictate that every job touches the value equation and every associate that has a job has real opportunities for advancement.
		2	Limited training and promotion opportunities	
		3	Good IT career paths for top performers	
		4	Multiple career paths, opportunities for training	
		5	Company promotes career-enhancement; continuous investment in training and job enrichment	
<b>Community Relations</b>	Impacts of alternative on community relations	1	Strong negative impact; reputational damage	We are working to develop quantifiable measures by which this dimension may be scored.
		2	Net negative impact	
		3	Net impact not substantive	
		4	Net positive impact	
		5	Strong positive impact; reputation enhancement	
<b>People Displacement</b>	Number of associates with lost jobs or significantly reduced jobs	1	Large number of associates with lost jobs	In recognition of both people and community values, we desire to minimize job losses. The company intends to treat associates fairly and would like to ensure that they have gainful employment for a reasonable period of time. The company has also indicated a willingness to commit funds to help to make this happen.
		2	Large number of associates with lost jobs or significantly reduced jobs	
		3	Majority of associates with job options	
		4	Majority of associates with job options (same or lateral) that do not require relocation	
		5	Great majority (>90%) of associates with career-enhancing job opportunities	