FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION CABINET
COMMONWEALTH OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY

Steven L. Beshear
Governor

Lori H. Flanery
Secretary
Finance and Administration Cabinet

101 Cold Harbor Drive
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
Phone: 502-564-1201
Fax: 502-564-5769
http://technology.ky.gov/

James M. Fowler
Chief Information Officer

Jim Barnhart
Deputy Commissioner

Senator Humphries
Representative Mills
Capital Planning Advisory Board

Dear Senator Humphries and Representative Mills,

I am pleased to submit to the Capital Planning Advisory Board the results of our review of the information technology projects for the next biennium. Members of my staff and agency representatives performed the review. We focused specifically on information technology projects for the 2016-2018 biennium utilizing a methodology that promotes an objective view to determine those systems with the highest value and least potential risk to the Commonwealth. The results of this review are contained within three reports:

- Appendix A: 2016-2018 All Funds Capital Information Technology Projects Listing
- Appendix B: 2016-2018 General Fund High Value Information Technology Projects
- Appendix C: 2016-2018 Chief Information Officer: Additional Priorities

Each capital project submission provides value and I feel the projects identified with the acronym of "HV" in the enclosed reports best support the strategic direction of the Commonwealth and provide the greatest returns on our investments.

Kentucky is making progress with our use of information technology to serve our citizens. I look forward to continuing to work with this body so that together we can continue to move Kentucky forward.

Sincerely,

James M. Fowler
Chief Information Officer

2016-2018 Capital Improvement Plans
July 2015

Executive Summary

The phrase 'electronic government' or 'e-gov' entered the mainstream vocabulary in 1993. In the past 22 years, Kentucky has had some significant victories in migrating from manual processes to electronic service delivery, however 'e-gov' is still not a mainstream reality in many areas of state government. While Kentucky leadership at all levels may understand the significant role that information technology (IT) plays in the delivery of citizen services, it is only recently that legislation such as KRS 14.250, KRS 14.255, and Governor Beshear's Executive Order 2012-880 have put an emphasis on its importance. Unfortunately, while pockets of spending have been allocated year to year, funding in support of 'e-gov' has not kept up with the demand. Kentucky has a considerable way to go before the technology that allows for 24/7 government is perceived as an integral part of the business of state government. The Commonwealth has even further to go before it is understood that technology is not merely an additional cost center nor is it a 'buy it and forget it' proposition. In reality, technology has become the core of today's society.

The rate of change in IT continues to increase exponentially with things that were mere dreams less than a decade ago, now part of day-to-day reality. The 'Internet of Things', or 'IoT', is as commonplace in trade magazines today as the World Wide Web was in 1993. Our citizens utilize these advances every day in their interaction with businesses and friends. They expect the same capabilities from their government. The Commonwealth must make a dedicated effort to provide the funding to allow state agencies the opportunity to enter into the 21st Century way of conducting business.

The agencies of the Commonwealth have submitted a variety of exciting and reasonable plans for ways to more efficiently and effectively serve their constituents. Presentations were well thought out and displayed a deep understanding of agency business needs and how IT can be utilized to perform 'more with less'. Considerable time and effort were spent gathering the necessary information to submit viable proposals. In few circumstances were the projects deemed by the scoring committee to be anything less than essential to the core business functions of the agency.

To start the review process, the Commonwealth Office of Technology (COT) once again worked with the Technology Advisory Council (TAC), to establish a workgroup to participate in all aspects of the Capital IT projects review and scoring process. Representatives from a wide array of state agencies, including the Cabinet for Economic Development, the Cabinet for Health and Family Services, the Education and Workforce Development Cabinet, Office of the State Budget Director, and the Public Protection Cabinet, joined COT on the scoring panel. These representatives also covered the functional breadth of information technology, business and finance. This review and scoring methodology continues to support the defined key strategic initiatives of the

Commonwealth: public safety, electronic health services, quality education, transportation infrastructure and efficient government services.

For the 2016-2018 biennium submission, agencies realize that a more prosperous economic upturn has been firmly re-established within the Commonwealth. They also wish to make the incoming administration aware of their long overdue IT needs. A total of 42 qualifying projects were submitted for the 2016-2018 biennium. This is nearly identical to the 2014-2016 cycle count of forty (40) projects.

Approximately $226.7 Million will be needed to fulfill all requests across all funding sources as opposed to the $267.6 Million in projects submitted by state agencies for consideration during the prior planning cycle. Only four (4) projects had a cost estimate over $10 Million with only one (1) true 'mega project' estimated to cost $55 Million, with the majority of that coming from Federal matching funds. The average cost across all projects is roughly $5.4 Million with a full twelve (12) projects costing $1 Million or less and an additional ten (10) costing between $1-2 Million. This continues to support evidence that 1) technology costs continue to drop, and 2) projected costs are diminishing because consolidated agencies are depending on COT-provided infrastructure and not having to procure it themselves.

There were a total of fifteen (15) projects that were repeat submissions from the previous cycle and nine (9) of these were repeats from the 2012-2014 biennium submissions. Several of these projects were presented in the 2014-2016 report as 'High Value' and were recommended to the Capital Planning Advisory Board for consideration of funding. Some of these same projects have earned the 'High Value' distinction again this time and monies should be found to support as many of these efforts as possible to make state government more efficient and provide additional 'any place, any time' service opportunities for our citizens.

Based upon the recommendations of the evaluation team, the Chief Information Officer of the Commonwealth has produced three reports for the Capital Planning Advisory Board to consider in its formulation of a statewide capital improvement plan. The first two reports are the direct result of COT's well established review methodology and evaluation process. These enclosed reports are titled:

- Appendix A: 2016-2018 All Funds Capital Information Technology Projects Listing
- Appendix B: 2016-2018 General Fund High Value Information Technology Projects

A third report highlights other projects that specifically enable the Commonwealth to achieve its strategic goals but fell just short mathematically of receiving an 'HV' designation. This enclosed report is titled:

- Appendix C: 2016-2018 Chief Information Officer: Additional Priorities

2016-2018 Capital Improvement Plans

Overview and Assessment of Information Technology Capital Items for the Capital Planning Advisory Board

Commonwealth Office of Technology
July 2015

Introduction

The Commonwealth Chief Information Officer (CIO) submits this report to the Capital Planning Advisory Board (CPAB) as requested and required by 1 KAR 6:020. At the request of the CPAB, the CIO is assigned the primary responsibility for information technology (IT) capital item review, assessment, prioritization and enterprise ranking for Executive branch agencies. The CPAB has requested that the CIO report capital IT items or systems to identify high priority needs, particularly those proposed to be financed from General Funds (cash or bonds). Additionally, the CPAB requested that the CIO present the criteria upon which the information technology items or systems are determined to have high value and priority. Finally, the CPAB encouraged the CIO to include in this report recommendations or information on any other items affecting information technology in state government, believed to be helpful to the CPAB in developing its statewide plan.

The CPAB will find in the presentation of this report that the CIO has once again undertaken a defined, disciplined and objective approach to the evaluation of capital IT requests submitted by executive branch state agencies. COT has worked closely with the Technology Advisory Council (TAC) to facilitate a thorough review and analysis resulting in the recommendations outlined in this report.

For the 2016-2018 capital planning cycle, 42 Capital IT qualifying projects were submitted by Executive branch state agencies. Additionally, COT has again coordinated with staff of the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) for their continued review of university plans, including IT capital items and systems. In addition, neither the CIO nor COT has oversight authority for information technology initiatives in the Legislative or Judicial branches as stipulated in KRS 11.509.

Summary of Capital IT Projects Submissions

The planned budget amounts of state agency capital items submitted for the 2016-2018 cycle totals approximately $226.7 Million. These monies are broken down into the following categories and compared to last cycle:

	2016-2018	2014-2016
• General Funds -	$146.0 M	$132.0 M
• Federal Funds -	36.5 M	102.6 M
• Restricted Funds -	29.5 M	19.0 M
• Road Funds -	13.4 M	6.0 M
• Private Funds -	1.3 M	8.0 M

Evaluation of Capital IT Projects

To execute its responsibility to provide a meaningful and justifiable review of capital IT submissions to the CPAB, and to objectively quantify the value and potential risk of the items and systems, COT continues to apply a disciplined, objective review and analysis process incorporating clearly defined criteria and scoring attributes. A formal evaluation tool also continues to be used by COT to facilitate the analysis and ranking of information technology projects.

Any technology endeavor must improve the manner in which the Commonwealth conducts business and ultimately must lead to the provision of better service to its citizens. To that end, COT again requested that agencies prepare their requests utilizing a formal business case template that would help clarify and quantify the value of each submission. Moreover, the inherent business value of any IT project should be delivered to the Commonwealth while introducing minimal or no additional amount of risk or duplicative efforts to either the project or the organization. Traditionally large dollar projects delivered as ‘big bang’ at the end of multiple years requiring considerable development or customization are at increased risk for not delivering upon the initially agreed scope. As a component of the 4 year enterprise IT strategic plan, this review cycle also gave consideration for those legacy systems that are becoming more difficult to modify to new business or legal requirements and increasingly more difficult to find staff to maintain because the development languages utilized are no longer being taught at colleges and universities across the nation. A total of twelve (12) of the submitted projects were for legacy system replacements.

Each proposed capital IT project was evaluated by the eight (8) member committee against the following independent criteria: Business Value and Risk Factors. The two (2) major criteria were comprised of a total of eleven (11) subcomponents as follows, each numerically weighted with an assigned ranking being explicitly defined:

Business Value:

Business Case & Justification
Efficiency includes Cost Savings or Avoidance, Revenue or Accountability
Executive Sponsorship
Service Improvement thru Shared Services
Improved Quality of Life for Citizens

Risk Factors:

Change in Total Cost of Ownership
System Data Classification
Solution Definition
Implementation Timeline
Level of Complexity
Legacy System Replacement

A composite business value index and risk factor index was derived for each capital IT project submission, with those projects exemplifying highest business value and lowest risk factors being ranked as achieving the designation of 'High Value'.

The two enclosed reports, detailing the ranking of the submitted projects are entitled:

- *Appendix A: 2016-2018 All Funds Capital Information Technology Projects Listing*
- *Appendix B: 2016-2018 General Fund High Value Information Technology Projects*

For a more detailed overview of the methodology and ranking process please see the document enclosed within this report entitled: *Appendix D: Information Technology Capital Project Review Process.*

Chief Information Officer: Additional Priorities

The CIO has defined a priority list of additional general fund capital IT projects based upon the strategic goals of the Commonwealth and interactive discussion with state agencies. These goals address priority areas throughout state government that may not have received 'HV' designation but are believed to have potential for maximizing agency business value with properly applied project and risk management.

The CIO proposes the following list of projects and designates them as critical because of their direct contribution to meeting the strategic goals of the Commonwealth.

- *Appendix C: 2016-2018 Chief Information Officer: Additional Priorities*

Information Technology Observations and Recommendations

1) COT worked closely with the Technology Advisory Council (TAC) on the development of its 2014-2018 Strategic Plan. One of the suggestions from those discussions was for COT to consider offering a rated service for document management, to include both the scanning of existing records or the creation of on-line electronic forms as well as workflows that would eliminate the necessity for paper documents completely. COT coordinated with a TAC workgroup on the creation of the submitted restricted fund project, 'Enterprise Document Management'. In addition to the COT project, several agencies submitted general fund projects requesting services for scanning or digitizing records or the development of electronic forms. COT feels this is a prime example of the role it should serve as the centralized technology provider for the executive branch. Although four (4) of these submitted projects scored as 'HV', COT believes that funding the centralized Enterprise Document management project could meet the needs of those agencies as well as the larger needs of the Executive branch. COT plans to continue efforts with the TAC workgroup to be ready to move forward on the 'Enterprise Document Management' project if funds are made available in support of this initiative during this budget cycle.

   COT also plans to work closely with the TAC earlier in the Capital IT project cycle for 2018-2020 to understand what additional consolidated service offerings it should prepare for unified project submission on behalf of the Executive Branch.

2) The Commonwealth's CIO believes that in the span of 5-7 years, COT will no longer directly provide infrastructure components but will instead be a broker of 'as a service' offerings. With this in mind, COT believes that ***KRS 45.750 Definitions for KRS 45.760 to 45.810***, should be reviewed for an update to item 1 (e) "information technology system" to allow for the utilization of 'as a Service' or the more common terminology, 'cloud' offerings, to be specifically included within the definition of "information technology system".

Appendix A: *All Funds Capital Information Technology Projects Listing*

Cabinet	Agency	Capital IT Project Title	Budget	Fund Source	High Value
		2016-2018			
CHFS	GAPS	Child Support System (KASES III)	55,250,000	GF/FF/RES	HV
CHFS	GAPS	DAIL System Modernization	700,000	GF	
CHFS	Public Health	DPH Budget, Accounting & Reporting System	3,600,000	GF/RES	HV
CHFS	Public Health	DPH Vital Statistics Phase I Digitized System	4,950,000	GF	HV
CHFS	Public Health	DPH Vital Statistics Phase II Scan & Image	7,100,000	GF	HV
CPE	Council on Postsecondary Ed.	Commonwealth College (HB265) Technology	4,000,000	GF	
CPE	Council on Postsecondary Ed.	KY Regional Optical Network Enhancement	1,000,000	GF	
CPE	Council on Postsecondary Ed.	KY Virtual Library Infrastructure Rebuild	8,500,000	GF	
Energy & Environ	Environmental Protection	Mobile Inspection Data Collection	924,000	GF	
Energy & Environ	Environmental Protection	Online Permitting/Submittals (eForms)	918,000	GF	
Energy & Environ	Environmental Protection	Public Information Review Portal	824,000	GF	HV
Ed/Workforce	Department of Education	Next Generation SEEK	1,760,000	RES	HV
Ed/Workforce	General Admin & Support	Enterprise Case Management System	30,000,000	GF	
Ed/Workforce	KY Educational Television	KET Digital Infrastructure Maintenance Pool	1,000,000	GF	HV
Finance	Commonwealth Office of Tech	Enterprise Document Management	19,104,000	RES	HV
Finance	Commonwealth Office of Tech	Enterprise Infrastructure	6,000,000	RES	HV
Finance	KY Lottery Corp	ERP Upgrade	600,000	PRIV	HV
Finance	KY Lottery Corp	Replace SalesForce Mgmt Solution	700,000	PRIV	HV
Finance	Revenue	Account Number Length Increase	2,000,000	GF	
Finance	Revenue	Aerial Photography Imagery	3,800,000	GF	
Finance	Revenue	Electronic Commerce	5,200,000	GF	HV
Finance	Revenue	Property Tax Systems Upgrade	8,600,000	GF	
Finance	Revenue	Registration Case Mgmt Upgrade	600,000	GF	
Finance	Revenue	Revenue OneStop Data Integration	2,000,000	GF	
Finance	Revenue	Tax Discovery System	2,300,000	GF	
Finance	Revenue	Tax Systems Updates	6,000,000	GF	
Finance	Office of the Secretary	KY Business One Stop Phase III	12,000,000	GF	HV
Gen Gov't	Registry of Election Finance	KREF System Modernization	1,836,000	GF	HV
Justice	Department of Corrections	Upgrade KY Offender Management System	1,330,000	GF	
Justice	Department of State Police	Computerized Criminal History Project	670,000	GF	
Justice	Department of State Police	Info Sys Infrastructure Upgrade	3,000,000	GF	
Justice	Department of State Police	Kentucky Interoperability Plan	2,000,000	GF	
Justice	Department of State Police	KYOPS Enhancement	2,000,000	GF	
Justice	Department of State Police	Replace/Upgrade Existing AFIS Phase II	2,600,000	GF	
Justice	Department of State Police	Vehicle/Mobile Radio Replacement	2,550,000	GF	HV
Tourism,Arts&Heritage	Center for the Arts	Technology Upgrades	900,000	GF	
Tourism,Arts&Heritage	KY Heritage Council	KHC Records Digitization	1,000,000	GF	HV
Tourism,Arts&Heritage	Parks	Cable Infrastructure Plan & Implementation	6,000,000	GF	HV
Transportation	Secretary's Office	TED (Transportation Enterprise Database) II	3,000,000	ROAD	HV
Transportation	Secretary's Office	Upgrade AASHTOware	2,900,000	ROAD	HV
Transportation	Vehicle Registration	International Registration Plan (IRP)	2,500,000	ROAD	
Transportation	Vehicle Registration	Real ID Driver's License Program	5,000,000	ROAD	HV
		Total	**$226,716,000**		

Appendix B: *General Fund High Value Information Technology Projects*

Cabinet	Agency	Capital Item/System Title	Budget	Fund Source
		2016-2018		
Finance	Office of the Secretary	KY Business One Stop Phase III	12,000,000	GF
CHFS	GAPS	Child Support System (KASES III)	16,285,000	GF/FF*
Gen Gov't	Registry of Election Finance	KREF System Modernization	1,836,000	GF
Energy & Environ	Environmental Protection	Public Information Review Portal	824,000	GF
Tourism,Arts&Heritage	Parks	Cable Infrastructure Plan & Implementation	6,000,000	GF
CHFS	Public Health	DPH Budget, Accounting & Reporting System	3,500,000	GF/RES*
Justice	Department of State Police	Vehicle/Mobile Radio Replacement	2,550,000	GF
Ed/Workforce	KY Educational Television	KET Digital Infrastructure Maintenance Pool	1,000,000	GF
CHFS	Public Health	DPH Vital Statistics Phase I Digitized System	4,950,000	GF
CHFS	Public Health	DPH Vital Statistics Phase II Scan & Image	7,100,000	GF
Finance	Revenue	Electronic Commerce	5,200,000	GF
Tourism,Arts&Heritage	KY Heritage Council	KHC Records Digitization	1,000,000	GF
		Total	**62,245,000**	

* Budget amount represents only the General Fund commitment of the total project amount

Appendix C: *Chief Information Officer: Additional Priorities*

Cabinet	Agency	Capital Item/System Title	Budget	Fund Source
		2016-2018		
Education	General Administration	Enterprise Case Management System	30,000,000	GF
Justice	Corrections	Upgrade KY Offender Mgmt System	1,330,000	GF
CHFS	GAPS	DAIL System Modernization	700,000	GF
		Total	**$32,030,000**	

Appendix D
Commonwealth Office of Technology
Information Technology Capital Project Review

Purpose
To define and apply an objective, disciplined, and justifiable methodology for reviewing and determining the value of information technology capital projects to the Commonwealth.

Scope
Executive Branch cabinet and agency information technology capital projects planned for the 2016 - 2018 biennium.

2015 Critical Dates (estimated)

JAN 5	Sign-off on criteria and process by Commonwealth's Chief Information Officer (CIO)
JAN 20	Present criteria and process to the Technology Advisory Council (TAC)
JAN 20	Provide criteria and process to the Capital Construction LRC support staff (Shawn Bowen)
JAN 21	Criteria and process available on Technology.ky.gov website
APR 15	All Capital Projects required to be submitted
JUN 1-5	Agency review meetings
JUL 1	CIO transmits final capital report to the Capital Construction LRC support staff (Shawn Bowen)
JUL 14	CIO presents final capital report to the Capital Projects Advisory Board (CPAB) Committee

Approach
1. COT will work with CPAB, OSBD and TAC to define capital project review criteria, methodology and timeline
2. Agencies will submit Capital IT Projects within the CPAB system assuring inclusion of TCO & Business Case components
3. Agencies will present an overview of their 2016 - 2018 capital plan and projects, addressing the criteria components, with discussion and Q&A to follow. A panel will evaluate and score each capital project.
4. NOTE: Criteria determined to be "N/A" for a specific project by the panel will result in an appropriate decrease in the scoring weight
5. COT Office of Enterprise Technology will rank projects based upon panel scoring and draft the Capital Projects Findings and Summary Report
6. The CIO will make final priority determination
7. COT will transmit the final capital report to the Capital Construction LRC support staff (Shawn Bowen)
8. The State CIO or designee will present the final capital report with recommendations to the Capital Projects Advisory Board Committee

Capital Project Review Criteria

Each proposed information technology capital project will be evaluated against two sets of criteria: Business Value and Risk Factors. Project ranking will be assessed against each component on a scale of 0 to 5, with each assigned ranking being explicitly defined. An objective score will be derived based upon an evaluation of the project as submitted to the Capital Planning Advisory Board, and upon a presentation and interactive discussion conducted with each agency's business, finance or information technology representative(s).

Business Value

Business Case
Has a business case been prepared and submitted to include such items as Business Need/Benefits, High-level Requirements and/or Features, Expected Risks, Critical Success Factors, Assumptions, Return on Investment (quantitative or qualitative), and Mean Time to Pay Back? Does the business case show a large and rapid justification for the investment?

Efficiency
Does the project outline demonstrable and quantifiable savings, revenue generation, or cost avoidance? Does the project provide additional transparency or accountability? Are efficiency gains SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Relevant, Time-limited)?

Executive Sponsorship
How important is the technology project considered among the entire cabinet's capital project priorities?

Service Improvement
Does the proposed project automate existing processes, or are processes being redefined prior to automation? Does the proposed project provide new online services to citizens or business? Does the proposed project support or directly enable the success of other project(s) either within the agency or across agencies?

Improved Quality of Life for Citizens
Will the project directly affect an improved quality of life for a percentage of Kentucky citizens through improved public health, education, safety, infrastructure, environmental issues, economic development or similar enterprise initiatives?

Risk Factors

Change in Total Cost of Ownership
What is the change in TCO of the project (includes new project hardware, software, state staffing, vendors/contractors, support and maintenance, etc. for the life of the initiative versus cost comparison of existing operation (manual or current system costs))?

Data Classification
Will the system contain personally identifiable data (PID) defined as 'sensitive' within Enterprise Architectural Standards subdomain 4080 (https://gotsource.ky.gov/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-301107/)? If so, how will this information be safeguarded within the system to deter identity theft?

Solution Definition
What is the anticipated level of effort to customize, develop, invent, or create the proposed solution? Is a solution available "off the shelf" that can meet a high percentage of the required functionality with minimal customization?

Implementation Timeline
How quickly will the project be implemented, and how quickly will the Commonwealth see a Return on Investment? Will the implementation be all at once ('big bang') or will the functionality be implemented in multiple, smaller phases or deliverables?

Level of Complexity
What is the level of effort and technical complexity required to make the project successful? Is the expertise to implement fully in-house or will contract staff be needed for some period of time? Are there skill sets currently available in-house to be used to manage the Vendor(s) that provide the solution? Has the Agency undergone a major system implementation in the last five (5) years? What business process re-engineering and change management efforts will be implemented as part of the project?

Legacy System
Will the project replace an existing system that is antiquated (based on outdated technology) or difficult to maintain/update because development resources are not available or difficult to find in the marketplace? Cumulative 'System Life Cycle Assessment' score of Risk Modernization Assessment will determine overall scoring (For calculation purposes, systems that score a 3 or 5 in this category will be evaluated without consideration of the Change in Total Cost of Ownership. Systems submitted that are not a legacy replacement will be calculated without this weight factor.)

Information Technology Capital Project Review Process

Business Value	**Wt**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**5**	**Max Score**
Business Case & Justification	6	None Provided	Minimal Information or Justification	Some level of detail but not clear or logical	Detailed, complete explanations with TCO, ROI, etc	**30**
Efficiency Includes Cost Savings or Avoidance, Revenue, or Accountability	6	None identified	Negligible or minimal opportunity	Significant opportunity expected; not quantified	Quantified, significant opportunity	**30**
Executive Sponsorship	6	Bottom 10% organization priority	Lower 50% organization priority	Upper 50% organization priority	Top 10% organization priority	**30**
Service Improvement	6	Update to existing system with no Business Process Reengineering Analysis	Update to existing system through some Business Process Reengineering Analysis	Replace existing processes through Business Process Reengineering Analysis	Automate existing manual processes including BPR analysis and/or offer new online service(s) for citizen	**30**
Improved Quality of Life for Citizens	6	Does not relate	Indirectly Supports	Directly affects a small % of KY citizens	Directly affects a large % of KY citizens	**30**
Scoring Weight	30				Subtotal	**150**

Risk Factors	**Wt**	**0**	**1**	**3**	**5**	**Max Score**
Change in Total Cost of Ownership (from Business Case)	5	>200M	100M to 150M	25M to 50M	< 15M	**25**
System will Contain Data Classified as 'Sensitive' within EAS 4080	5	No determination of data content	No Explanation of how PID will be safeguarded	Partial Explanation of how PID will be safeguarded	Detailed Explanation of how PID will be safeguarded or no PID	**25**
Solution Definition	5	Solution must be developed 'from scratch' or customized >50%	Solution must be customized >25% to < 50%	Solution must be customized (10% to < 25%	Solution is readily available with minor customization expected (<10%)	**25**
Implementation Timeline	5	Phases > 2 years or 'Big Bang'	Phases > 1 year but < 2 years	Phases < 1 year but > 6 months	Phases < 6 months	**25**
Level of Complexity	5	Extremely Difficult	Difficult	High	Medium to Low	**25**
Legacy System Replacement	5	Score of "Phase 1" on Risk Modernization Assessment	Score of "Phase 2" on Risk Modernization Assessment	Score of "Phase 3" on Risk Modernization Assessment	Score of "Phase 4" on Risk Modernization Assessment	**25**
Scoring Weight	**30**				**Subtotal**	**150**

Project Value Ranking

Project value ranking will be determined by relating the Business Value with the Manageability of the proposed project. The total score in each category is divided by the total weighting (30) to derive axis placement.