Epic Hypothesis Statement Template

Funnel Entry	Aug 15, 2022						
Date:							
Epic Name:	Duck Insights Data Mart Enrichment						
Product	Matt Betker, Service De	elivery Mana	ger, Azure DevOps				
Manager:							
Business	Director of Data Manag	gement & An	alytics (starting Sep	tember 2022)			
Owner:							
Request		□Gov	ernment insertion	of work			
Туре:							
Strategic	Choose the Strategic			will fall under, or \Box			
Themes/	Customer	Product Innovation	Process Automation	NOVA/Technology	People, Culture, Business Leadership Capabilities		
Initiatives:		Product	☐ IFRS 17/9	□ NOVA Finance	Leadership Capabilities ☐ Culture 2.0 ☐ Adopt SAFe		
	Customer	Roadmap	-	Deliverables	☐ Talent 2.0 ☐ Change		
	Standards	□ Road	Op Model	□ NOVA	☐ Professional Management		
	☐ Customer	Safety	☐ Core Process	Legislation	& Leadership Future		
	Experience	Strategy	Re-Engineering	_	Development Workplace		
	Maturity		Vision	□ NOVA 2021/22			
			☐ ALM	Delivery			
			Optimization Op Risk	☐ IT Transformation			
			Management	& TRM/ISM			
				□ NOVA Op			
				Readiness			
Impacted			rox. number of		Level of Impact		
Groups:	- I		cted individuals		•		
	Employees		ly the LDW Project – expanding to 100	\square Significant \boxtimes N	/loderate □Minor ⊠None		
			oyees – witnin the				
	Comico Contoro		Corporation		4		
	Service Centers				Moderate □Minor ⊠None		
	Autopac Agents				Moderate ☐ Minor ☒ None		
	Partners				Moderate ☐ Minor ☒ None		
	MPI Customers				Moderate ☐ Minor ☑ None		
	Others, please spec	city		□Significant □N	Moderate □Minor ⊠None		

	<u> </u>					
Epic	For business users who consume policy data					
Description:	who need to glean business insights on said data					
	the Duck Data Mart Enrichment					
	is a enhancement					
	that will enable similar reporting grandul	arity to Autopac Online (AOL)				
	unlike what is offered by Duck out of the	box				
	our solution allows for similar reporting o	detail to what business users have come to expect from our legacy systems				
	The initiative is requesting approval for full budget in support of this initiative.	unding of \$150,000 from the 2022/23 Data Management and Analytics				
Business	This is pre-requisite work for the LD	W, to ensure Duck Insights data is available at the correct				
Outcome	I	option. This work will be considered done when the scope of the				
Hypothesis:	[Redacted]'s CR is complete.	·				
		work as you the agreed wash CD 151054, and MDI stoff				
Leading		work as per the agreed upon CR 151054, and MPI staff				
Indicators:	have validated its accuracy.					
Non-	Category	Details of NFR				
Functional	1 Architecture	Enhanced data sources are accessible from the LDW environments				
Requirements	2 Communication, Training & Documentation	N/A				
(NFRs):	3 Implementation Approach	N/A				
	4 Information and Security	N/A				
	5 Integration	N/A				
	6 Legal	N/A				
	7 Operational Support Model 8 Organizational Change	N/A N/A				
	Implications (Roles,					
	Responsibilities)					
	9 Vendor Management	N/A				
	10 Regulatory Accountability	N/A				
	10 Others – Nova Analytics Team Nova Analytics Team have provided requirements to [Redacted] who will be engaged to complete the scope of work.					

Delete sample form (page 1 & 2) before submitting EHS template to the LPM Intake page. Upload completed EHS template to the $\underline{\mathit{LPM}}$ Intake Page and complete the $\underline{\mathit{WSJF}}$ Calculator template.

Note: If changes are required to the document, locate the Epic Name from the "My Submissions" area, click "Edit", locate the attachment to edit and click to open, click "Edit Document" and edit the save the document. Click the "Save" button at the bottom of the epic form.

Lean Business Case for DMA Duck Data Mart Enrichment

Epic/Business Case Name: DMA Duck Data Mart Enrichment	Epic Number: (Assigned by APMO) 191416	Business Case Number: 2023-021
Prepared By: Matt Betker, Service Delivery Manager	Business Owner: Syed Qadri, Director of Data Management and Analytics	Business Case Funnel Entry Date: 08/29/2022
Department: Data Management and Analytics	Division: IT Division	☑ Single Year Budget ☐ Multi-Year Budget

1	- op a			_ 06.0 . 00 20.0600					
	Data Management and Analytics	IT Division		☐ Multi-Year Budget					
	Key Stakeholders: (List the names of key stakeholders)								
	Data Management and Analytics department – Consumers of work								
	Other business units at MPI who will	require access to	Duck Policy Data						
	Epic Description: (From Epic Hypothesis Statement. Then brief explanation of business need and describe final deliverable) For business users who consume policy data who need to glean business insights on said data the Duck Data Mart Enrichment is a enhancement that will enable similar reporting grandularity to Autopac Online (AOL) unlike what is offered by Duck out of the box our solution allows for similar reporting detail to what business users have come to expect from our legacy systems								
	☑ Corporate Strategic Initiative/Strea	am							
	☐ Government directive ☐ Other Brief description: (Elaborate on source of request if this will provide additional context (i.e. what was government request, where								
	does strategic initiative fit in to the annual strategic plan etc)								
	Business Outcome Hypothesis: (See E Statement. Describe evidence that MVPs are y how the success of the epic will be measured: increase in shoppers under 25; Availability inc 99.7%, etc indicate that these outcomes wo	functional; Describe for example, 50% creases from 95% to	innovation accounting moutcomes hypothesis: fo	(See Epic Hypothesis Statement. Establish netrics to provide leading indicators of the rexample, a measurable change in swithin 30 days of feature release, earned					

on an ongoing basis and list milestone dates if known)

This is pre-requisite work for the LDW, to ensure Duck Insights data is available at the correct granularity for MPI business consumption. This work will be considered done when the scope of the [Redacted]'s CR is complete. When [Redacted] completes their work as per the agreed upon CR 151054, and MPI staff have validated its accuracy.

In Scope:

- [Redacted] (vendor) to perform Duck data mart enrichment.
- MPI Staff to validate the work was done correctly.
- ...

Out of Scope:

- None
- •
- •

Nonfunctional Requirements: (See Epic Hypothesis Statement – that lists definition. In addition list the internal departments that need to be consulted to assess impact to implementation)

- Architecture Enhanced data sources are accessible from the LDW environment
- Communications n/a
- Implementation Approach n/a
- Integration n/a
- Vendor Management n/a
- Legal n/a
- Operational Support Model n/a
- Organizational Change Implications (Roles, Responsibilities) – n/a
- Information Security Office n/a
- Regulatory Accountability

Does this project require that any new legislation be introduced, or existing legislation be amended or repealed? (Acts or Regulations)

☐ Yes ☑ No

Does this project require that any new Policies and Forms (Regulatory Instruments) be introduced, or existing Policies or Forms be amended or repealed?

☐ Yes ☑ No

If the answer to either question is Yes, the Regulatory Accountability Office must be consulted. The RAO must complete the following:

Review Date: MM/DD/YYYY **Reviewer:**

This project is determined to be a "Regulatory Project" as per the Regulatory Accountability Act and must be coordinated with the RAO:

☐ Yes ☐ No

Minimum Viable Product (MVP) Features — (early indicator — functional, working, in production and delivers value. Example is MS 365 and how basic functionality was created as initial MVP and plan is for features to be added — calendar (feature), file sharing (feature), etc.)

Completion of work as per ADO CR 151054.

Additional Potential Features – (building on the MVP – represents other features of lower priority and anticipated timing.)

- None
- ...
- ...

Analysis Summary: (Brief summary of the analysis that has been formed to create the business case. Outcome of discussion from Cadence meetings resulting from Epic Hypothesis Statement, and reference material (white papers), preliminary costing – benefits as part of the outcomes defined in the Epic Hypothesis Statement. Any proof of concepts that were completed – artifacts and research.)

Upon reviewing the information available via the Duck Data Mart, MPI architects and Analysts realized it would not be sufficient for reporting needs at MPI. Due to capacity constraints, MPI hired [REDACTED] to perform the work of enhancing the Mart to offer policy detail more accustom to what MPI business users are used to.

This work will be consumed via the Logical Data Warehouse (LDW) at a later date.

Milestones/Checkpoints: (include milestone or checkpoint dates for MVP(s) start/completion if known)
Duck Data Mart Enrichment completed by
[REDACTED] by August 31, 2022
Enrichment work is validate by an MPI analyst from the NOVA Analytics team.
October 15, 2022.

Approval Request/Recommendation for LPM Committee: (Define the ask – resources, specific incremental funding based on detailed costing to be completed to support the recommendation.)

This work has already been committed to through NOVA. Our recommendation is to approve this Epic in order for the DM&A department to cover the costs associated with these changes.

The initiative is requesting endorsement for approval of \$150,000 from the 2022/23 Data Management & Analytics budget in support of this initiative.

Solution Analysis- (completed in collaboration with Solution Group) The Cadence meetings will assist in this process with input from stakeholders

Which Internal and/or external customers are affected, and how? (Describe the user community and any markets affected)

The foundational work is a requirement as part of supporting internal reporting requirements by Business Users who require access to policy data to facilitate this process.

What is the potential impact on solutions, programs and services? (Identify solutions, programs, services, teams, departments, etc. that will may be impacted by this epic)

It continue to provide MPI business users with access to the same level of policy data grandularity users are currently using as part of reporting as accessible within AOL today.

What is the potential impact on sales, distribution, deployment and support? (For external solutions or products, describe any potential impact on how the product is sold, distributed, or deployed)

There may be some future enhancements performed to this code base as required by the Data Management and Analytics department.

Forecasted Costs – TO BE COMPLETED BY SOLUTION GROUP					
T-Shirt Estimates: (As included in Epic Hypothesis Statement) Small – MPI is only responsible to verify [Redacted]'s work.	Details: (As included in Epic Hypothesis Statement) N/A				
MVP Cost: (What is the investment requested to fund the MVP (the MVP cost)? Include date of MVP cost estimate being requested.) The DM&A department has budgeted \$150,000 for this work. The money will come from the 3.1M budgeted for Data and Analytics projects in the 2022/23 fiscal year.	Estimated Implementation Cost: (What is the estimated investment (cost) of full implementation of the epic if the MVP hypothesis is proven true? This estimate is refined of over time) \$150,000 Initial estimate: (This can be expressed as a range) Refined estimate(s): (Identify material updates to the estimated implementation cost, usually informed from experiments. Include date of refined estimate.)				
Force	acted Poturns				

Forecasted Returns

Type of Return: (Market share, increased revenue, improved productivity, new markets served, reduced risk, financial net present value etc.)

Improved productivity when accessing Duck policy data.

Development Strategy (completed in collaboration with Solution Group)

In-house or Outsourced Development: (Provide recommendations for where the epic should be developed) Outsourced development to [Redacted]. MPI will only be validating the work.

Incremental Implementation Strategy: (Epics are defined as a single whole, but each epic undergoes incremental implementation. Click <u>here</u> for details on potential strategies. i.e. Spike first, Some features first, Architectural epic first, vertical slice, concurrent/sequential implementation etc...)

Implementation will be coordinated with the NOVA analytics team.

Sequencing and Dependencies: (Describe any constraints for sequencing the epic and identify any potential dependencies with other epics or solutions)

Verification will need to be completed before production deployment.

Risk Analysis						
		•	(A high likelihood of risk without sufficient planned action for Present Value of forecasted financial benefits. Impact to be			
discussed with VMO)	Odine . d. I	Tours of the	,			
Potential Risk	Likelihood	Severity	Description of Impact of Risk and			
			description of planned action taken to			
			mitigate this risk			
NOVA Analytics team	☐ High	☐ High	Verification will need to be deferred until NOVA analytics			
are taken off critical	□ Medium	☐ Medium	work is off the critical path.			
path activities to	☑ Low	☑ Low				
complete verification.						
	☐ High	☐ High				
	☐ Medium	☐ Medium				
	☐ Low	☐ Low				
	☐ High	☐ High				
	☐ Medium	☐ Medium				
	□ Low	☐ Low				
Risks/Obstacles of NOT Pro	ceeding with Pro	ject				
Potential Risk	Likelihood	Severity	Description of Impact of Risk and			
		-	description of planned action taken to			
			-			
This were will have to be			mitigate this risk			
This work will have to be performed by someone	☐ High ☑ Medium	☐ High ☑ Medium	N/A			
prior to setting up the	☑ Medium □ Low	☑ Medium □ Low				
Duck data source within	LOW LOW	□ LOW				
the LDW.						
	☐ High	☐ High				
	☐ Medium	☐ Medium				
	□ Low	□ Low				
	☐ High	☐ High				
	☐ Medium	☐ Medium				
	□ Low	□Low				
/W/hat are you assur	ming to ha true or h	Assum	ptions e you assuming will prevail that will make this achievable)			
Cost Assumptions	ning to be true, or w		A quote from [Redacted] around \$150,000			
(What sources were used to g	generate costs)		A quote nom [Neudelou] around \$150,000			
Cost/Benefit Assumptions			None			
(What discount rate was used	1)					
Other Assumptions			[Redacted] will deliver within their quoted amount.			

Alternative Solutions (Describe at least two available alternatives that would achieve the project objectives)						
Alternative 1	This development is handled internally at a later time.					
Alternative 2						
Evaluation Areas	Alternative 1	Alternative 2				
Benefits (Financial/Non-financial)	None					
Cost	None, as this would require external labour due to capacity constraints					
Risk	Work may not be ready when needed.					
Reason for not selecting this solution						

Additional Supporting Data (completed in collaboration with Solution Group)

Attachments: (Other supporting documentation, links to other data, feasibility or trade studies, models, market analysis, etc., that were used in the creation of the business case)

Reference to the CR in ADO: <u>Change Request 151054: CR#9: Assessment of R1A Reports - Insights - Boards</u> (azure.com)

Other Notes and Comments: (Any additional miscellaneous Information relevant to LPM) None.

ECM Knowledge Platforms - Epic Hypothesis Statement

Funnel Entry	August 2022							
Date:								
Epic Name:	ECM Knowledge Pi	atforms						
Product	• Joelle Cur	taz (Product I	Manager, ECM)					
Manager:	Role: Lead	d Product Ma	nager					
		rsaga (Manag 5 Manager	ger, KMS, Technico	al Writing & Commu	inications)			
Business	Tamara B	oblinski – Dir	ector, Change & K	nowledge Managen	nent			
Owner:			Corporate Knowle					
	Stakeholders							
Dominat	 Christian Sentner (Manager, Design & Digital Experience) Role: Branding/Front End TBC - Director, Communications, Brand & Marketing Role: Communications Bradley Moore - Director, Customer Experience Role: Brand and Experience Peter Garn - Director, Enterprise Application Management Role: Application / Service Platform Shawn Campbell - Director, Enterprise Architecture Role: Technology Strategy, Corporate Strategy Technical Enablement 							
Request	⊠Internal reques	t ⊔Gov	ernment insertion	of work				
Type:	Chaosa tha Strata	ric Thomas /In	vitiatives this Enio	will fall under or	None Listed			
Strategic Themes/	Customer	Product	Process	will fall under, or \Box	None Listed People, Culture,	Business		
Initiatives:	Focus	Innovation	Automation	NOVA/Technology	Leadership	Capabilities		
muutives.	 ☑ Operationalize Customer Standards ☐ Customer Experience Maturity 	✓ Product Roadmap✓ RoadSafetyStrategy	☐ IFRS 17/9 ☐ EPM & Target Op Model ☑ Core Process Re-Engineering Vision ☐ ALM Optimization ☑ Op Risk Management	□ NOVA Finance Deliverables □ NOVA Legislation Changes NOVA 2021/22 □ Delivery IT □ Transformation & TRM/ISM NOVA Op □ Readiness	☐ Culture 2.0 ☐ Talent 2.0 ☐ Professional & Leadership Development	☐ Adopt SAFe ☐ Change ☐ Management ☐ Future ☐ Workplace		
	L					•		

Impacted		Approx. number of affected individuals		Level of I	mpact	
Groups:	Employees	All Staff (2000)	⊠Significant	□Moderate	□Minor	□None
	Service Centers	Knowledge Portals,		□Moderate	Minor	□None
		Workflows (1000)	J			
	Autopac Agents	Knowledge Portals	⊠Significant	\square Moderate	\square Minor	□None
	Dartners	(340+ locations) DEIC, Repair Shops	Cianificant	M M a da vata		□None
	Partners	DEIC, Repair Shops	□Significant	⊠Moderate	□Minor	□None
Epic	Context:					
Description:	[REDACTED]					
	Opportunity:					
		multiple publishing solu	utions. The goa	al of the initia	tive is to i	mplement a
	•	e publishing solution o				•
	the content within	the Public Website, Int	ranet, Knowle	dgeNet and E	Brokers On	iline. Moving
	towards a single p	roduct for publishing w	ill improve bus	siness and IT o	perations	;.
		erve as a building block	•			
		dge Management Servi	ces (KMS) serv	ices including	MPI parti	ners, such as
	Brokers, to this ne	w platform.				
	Hypothesis:					
	For MPI staff and Br	okers				
	who need informati	on about MPI products, s	ervices and bus	iness processes	5	
	the integrated know					
	is a web portal that	connects knowledge seek	ers with curate	d content		
	·	na based search and auto				
		olution which does not pr	_			=
		seamless content distrib		-		
	content	pased on personalization p	neierences, and	JW CUI ators the	ability to p	Jubiisii targeteu
	Content					
	Execution:					
		managed by the ECM I	-			
		a , Manager, KMS Tech	nical Writing a	ınd Communi	cations, as	s the Business
	Owner.					
Business	Measurable benefits	that the business can an	ticipate if the en	oic hypothesis i	s proven co	 orrect include:
Outcome		simplify the publishing p		••	•	
Hypothesis:	· ·	usiness to make changes t				
		ntent search time, improv	ed content rele	vance		
	 Improvement of 	f accessibility standards				

Leading	 Reduction in time to publish and update articles: automation of the publishing process Automation of content replication: # related content zones are automatically updated 						
Indicators:	Reduced dependency of IT technical resources: additional self-service processes						
		ind User Personalization: # favor	·				
			-				
	• F	Provide new publishing options: #	# of Styles and content zones				
Non-		Category	Details of NFR				
F	1	Architecture	Cloud First Alignment, Utilizes existing assets in [Redacted]				
Functional	2	Communication, Training &	Draft communication to impacted internal and external				
Requirements		Documentation	stakeholders				
(NFRs):	3	Implementation Approach	Availability of implementation plan to support smooth				
(INFRS).			transition and migration from on premise to the cloud				
	4	Information and Security	Adherence with all current CIS Policies and Standards				
	5	Integration	Allow secure and real time and on demand integration capabilities				
	6	Legal	Compliance to regulatory and contractual requirements and				
			other legal and regulatory requirements on data residency,				
			data, privacy and cloud				
	7	Operational Support Model	An ECM team is being established to manage [Redacted]				
	8	Organizational Change	Significant change for users of KnowledgeNet and Brokers				
		Implications (Roles,	Online. Communications and change management support will				
		Responsibilities)	be needed. None at this time				
	9	Vendor Management					
	10	Availability	99% availability and disaster recovery plan in place ensuring ease of recovery in the event of an outage				
	11	Scalability	Cloud based solution can meet spikes in website demand				
	12	Performance	The application load time must be no more than 2 seconds				
		Terrormance	The application load time must be no more than 2 seconds				

Delete sample form (page 1 & 2) before submitting EHS template to the LPM Intake page. Upload completed EHS template to the LPM Intake Page.

Lean Business Case for ECM Knowledge Platforms

Epic/Business Case Name: ECM Knowledge Platforms	Epic Number: 173577	Business Case Number: 2023-020
Prepared By: Joelle Curtaz, Value Stream Product Manager, Product Management Gary Pronych, Consultant, Enterprise Architecture	Business Owner: Tamara Boblinski, Director, Change and Knowledge Management	Business Case Funnel Entry Date: 08/17/2022
Department:	Division:	☑ Single Year Budget
Product Management, Enterprise Architecture	IT	☐ Multi-Year Budget

Key Stakeholders: (List the names of key stakeholders)

Christian Sentner (Manager, Design & Digital Experience)

Role: Branding/Front End

TBC - Director, Communications, Brand & Marketing

Role: Communications

• Bradley Moore - Director, Customer Experience

Role: Brand and Experience

Peter Garn - Director, Enterprise Application Management

Role: Application / Service Platform

Shawn Campbell – Director, Enterprise Architecture

Role: Technology Strategy, Corporate Strategy Technical Enablement

Epic Description: (From Epic Hypothesis Statement. Then brief explanation of business need and describe final deliverable)

Context:

Microsoft is discontinuing support for SharePoint 2013 as of April 11, 2023 which will ultimately result in significant risk to our entire SharePoint 2013 Platform which is classified as a tier one platform. The SharePoint solution hosts Brokers Online, KnowledgeNet and other solutions from the impacted groups above such as Intranet and SharePoint sites. This release will have to be coordinated around the R1 and R2 release dates.

Opportunity:

Currently MPI has multiple publishing solutions. The goal of the initiative is to implement a standardized, single publishing solution on [Redacted] that will be used as part of publishing the content within the Public Website, Intranet, KnowledgeNet and Brokers Online. Moving towards a single product for publishing will improve business and IT operations.

This solution will serve as a building block and provide additional opportunities to move additional Knowledge Management Services (KMS) services including MPI partners, such as Brokers, to this new platform.

Hypothesis:

For MPI staff and Brokers

who need information about MPI products, services and business processes

the integrated knowledge portal

is a web portal that connects knowledge seekers with curated content that provides persona based search and automated content recommendations unlike the current solution which does not provide a single source of truth for knowledge our solution allows seamless content distribution to relevant personas, content is recommended and easily discoverable based on personalization preferences, allow curators the ability to publish targeted content **Execution:** The project will be managed by the ECM Project Manager, Joelle Curtaz, in partnership with Janine Pursaga, Manager, KMS Technical Writing and Communications, as the Business Owner. ☑ Corporate Strategic Initiative/Stream ☐ Government directive ☐ Other Brief description: (Elaborate on source of request if this will provide additional context (i.e. what was government request, where does strategic initiative fit in to the annual strategic plan etc..) **Business Outcome Hypothesis: Leading Indicators:** Measurable benefits that the business can anticipate if Reduction in time to publish and update articles: the epic hypothesis is proven correct include: automation of the publishing process Standardize and simplify the publishing process Automation of content replication: # related content Empower the business to make changes to zones are automatically updated administer the solution Reduced dependency of IT technical resources: additional self-service processes Reduction of content search time, improved content relevance End User Personalization: # favorite tags, content types, etc Improvement of accessibility standards Provide new publishing options: # of styles and content zones In Scope: Out of Scope: **Nonfunctional Requirements:** Architecture - Cloud First Alignment, **MPI Partners** KnowledgeNet Utilizes existing assets in [Redacted] **Brokers Online** Allother portals Communication, Training & **Documentation** - Draft communication to impacted internal and external stakeholders Implementation Approach - Availability of implementation plan to support smooth transition and migration from on premise to the cloud **Information and Security** - Adherence with all current CIS Policies and Standards **Integration** - Allow secure and real time and on demand integration capabilities Legal - Compliance to regulatory and

contractual requirements and other legal and regulatory requirements on data residency, data, privacy and cloud **Operational Support Model** -An ECM team is being established to manage

Organizational Change Implications - Significant change for users of

[Redacted]

	Does be in or re You Does and I intro amer You If the Regular Const follook Reviews This Projection	KnowledgeNet and Brokers Online. Communications and change management support will be needed. Vendor Management - None at this time Availability - 99% availability and disaster recovery plan in place ensuring ease of recovery in the event of an outage Scalability - Cloud based solution can meet spikes in website demand Performance - The application load time must be no more than 2 seconds Regulatory Accountability Is this project require that any new legislation performs (Acts or Regulations) The second of the sec
 Minimum Viable Product (MVP) Features Consistent branding and user experience Simplified authoring and publishing Simplified search Content tagging 	represents other featuresBroker and user fIntegration with	·

Analysis Summary:

- Assess market trends and best practices
- Costing with potential vendors
- Assess business requirements
- Assess corporate objectives
- Assess team capacity and priorities
- Involvement security and records management

Milestones/Checkpoints:

Jan – April 2022: Requirements and Market

Assessment (Complete)

Sept – Oct 2022: Onboard Consultants Oct – Feb 2023: Design, Implementation,

Content conversion

Jan – Feb 2023: Proof of concept using

sample business area content Feb - April 2023: MVP Launch

Approval Request/Recommendation for LPM Committee: (Define the ask – resources, specific incremental funding based on detailed costing to be completed to support the recommendation.)

Project Funding

The budget for this Epic is part of the 2022/23 Capital Master Summary - Knowledge Platforms & Content Management funding envelope and the Public website & Partner website funding envelope (\$2M in each envelope).

Note that in the Context section of the Epic Description above, all four epics, 3113, 3114, 3141, and this request, will be part of these two funding envelopes.

Total forecasted cost is \$1,001,650 as per the WSJF project costs table and funding allocations are \$663,000 to Knowledge Platforms & Content Management and \$338,650 allocated to Public Website and Partner Website.

Solution Analysis- (completed in collaboration with Solution Group) The Cadence meetings will assist in this process with input from stakeholders

Which Internal and/or external customers are affected, and how? (Describe the user community and any markets affected)

All employees that use KnowledgeNet will be impacted.

Brokers are impacted as they use Brokers Online.

Positive impact through improved search, engagement, knowledge management.

Negative impacts include learning a new solution.

What is the potential impact on solutions, programs and services? (Identify solutions, programs, services, teams, departments, etc. that will may be impacted by this epic)

Communications & Brand

- The internal and external brand will be standardized
- Publishing processes need to change to support the new technology

Employee and Broker, Digital Experience

- The internal and external experience will be improved
- External authentication will be improved as brokers will use the same login for all MPI services

Nova

• Internal and external stakeholders will use KnowledgeNet and Brokers Online to learn about existing services and changes delivered through Nova

What is the potential impact on sales, distribution, deployment and support? (For external solutions or products, describe any potential impact on how the product is sold, distributed, or deployed)

Positive

- Improvements in how communication is distributed
- Improved ability to meet accessibility objectives

Negative

• Support: Employees, Brokers and support staff need to learn the new solution

No change expected

sales and distribution are not expected to change

Forecasted Costs – TO BE COMPLETED BY SOLUTION GROUP			
T-Shirt Estimates: (As included in Epic Hypothesis	Details: (As included in Epic Hypothesis Statement)		
Statement)	Refer to the go / no go section		
(As included in Epic Hypothesis Statement)			
MVP Cost: (What is the investment requested to fund the	Estimated Implementation Cost: (What is the estimated		
MVP (the MVP cost)? Include date of MVP cost estimate being	investment (cost) of full implementation of the epic if the MVP		
requested.)	hypothesis is proven true? This estimate is refined of over time)		
Refer to the go / no go section.	Refer to the go / no go section		
Beyond MVP will be executed by the existing	Refer to the go / no go section		
operational team.	Initial estimate: (This can be expressed as a range)		
	Refined estimate(s): (Identify material updates to the estimated		
	implementation cost, usually informed from experiments. Include date		
	of refined estimate.)		

Forecasted Returns

Type of Return: (Market share, increased revenue, improved productivity, new markets served, reduced risk, financial net present value etc.)

Cost Reduction: Elimination of SharePoint 2013 hosting of 72,000/year

Development Strategy (completed in collaboration with Solution Group)

In-house or Outsourced Development:

External resources will be used to define the architecture, backlog, security needs and feature implementation. Internal resources (Digital Experience) will support the user experience and brand.

Incremental Implementation Strategy:

Refer to the milestones section.

The MVP must be equal to, or greater than the existing solution to meet the business needs.

This solution is required for Nova to support MPI employees and brokers. The current approach is to release a fully functional MVP after release 1A.

Sequencing and Dependencies:

This solution is a requirement to retire SharePoint 2013 by April 2023.

- 1. Guidance from the vendor for design and content conversion
- 2. MVP release to be aligned with Nova

Refer to the milestones section for more details.

		Risk A	nalysis
	_		nood of risk without sufficient planned action for mitigation may forecasted financial benefits. Impact to be discussed with VMO)
Potential Risk	Likelihood	Severity	Description of Impact of Risk and description of planned action taken to mitigate this risk
Epic is not completed by April 2023	☐ High☐ Mediur☐ Low	☑ High □ Medium □ Low	Prepare to run the new solution in an MVP state.
Content is not fully migrated by MVP date	☐ High ☑ Mediur	☐ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low	Automate content migration and procure external resources to assist in content migration
Lack of understanding how these solutions fit into the Nova big picture	☐ High ☑ Mediur	☐ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low	Engagement with the Directors of Communication and Employee Experience to map out how these solutions could integrate into the digital experience
Risks/Obstacles of NOT P	roceeding wit	h Project	
Potential Risk	Likelihood	Severity	Description of Impact of Risk and description of planned action taken to mitigate this risk
Malious attack	☑ High □ Medium □ Low	☑ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low	Randsome attack. Limited mitigation, a) pay the randsome b) extremely manual process of backup and migration in a secure location
Service availability	☑ High☐ Medium☐ Low☐ High☐ Medium	☐ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low ☐ High ☐ Medium	Employees and brokers will not be able to access knowledge on our products and services
	☐ Low	☐ Low	
		Assun	nptions
(What are you assum	ing to be true, or	what conditions a	re you assuming will prevail that will make this achievable)
Cost Assumptions (What sources were used to go	enerate costs)		g rates at market value. onal software is needed.
Cost/Benefit Assumptions (What discount rate was used)			ng SharePoint 2013 environment can be fully sioned eliminating \$72,000\$/yearly
Other Assumptions		Chana Dain	at 2013 life will not be extended by the vendor, if

provided, the costs will be beyond the costs of this epic

Alternative Solutions (Describe at least two available alternatives that would achieve the project objectives)				
Alternative 1	Adoption of product: Unily			
Alternative 2	Adoption of product: Bloomfire			
Evaluation Areas	Alternative 1	Alternative 2		
Benefits (Financial/Non-financial)	Leverage our existing investment in SharePoint Online	Market leading knowledge management solution. Many features of the box		
Cost	High, yearly reoccurring fees	High, expensive product. Limited support and customization options.		
Risk	Medium; doesn't meet all requirements, customization is limited	Medium; Does not meet all requirements. We have little to no ability to close requirement gaps.		
Reason for not selecting this solution	Does not meet key requirements out of the box.	Does not meet all requirements. We have little to no ability to close requirement gaps.		

Additional Supporting Data (completed in collaboration with Solution Group)

Attachments: (Other supporting documentation, links to other data, feasibility or trade studies, models, market analysis, etc., that were used in the creation of the business case)

Other Notes and Comments: (Any additional miscellaneous Information relevant to LPM)

This LBC represents the 4th of the 4 projects being funded by the FY2022/23 capital budget.

The solution is related to the Enterprise Content Management strategic Initiative.

Epic Hypothesis Statement Template

Funnel Entry	Apr 29, 2022					
Date:						
Epic Name:	EHS – eTransfer To	otal Loss (#17	7369)			
Product	Kerry Skibinski, Coi	nsultant, Stra	tegy & Portfolio N	1anagement		
Manager:						
Business	Michael Gandhi, C	orporate Con	troller, Corporate	Controller Office		
Owner:						
Request Type:	⊠Internal reques	t □Gov	ernment insertior	of work		
Strategic	Choose the Strates	gic Themes/Ir	nitiatives this Epic	will fall under, or \Box	None Listed	
Themes/	Customer Focus	Product Innovation	Process Automation	NOVA/Technology	People, Culture, Leadership	Business Capabilities
Initiatives:	✓ Operationalize	□ Product	☐ IFRS 17/9	NOVA Finance NOVA Finance	Culture 2.0	☐ Adopt SAFe
	Customer	Roadmap	☐ EPM & Target	Deliverables	☐ Talent 2.0	☐ Change
	Standards	☐ Road	Op Model	□ NOVA	☐ Professional &	Management
	☐ Customer	Safety	☐ Core Process	Legislation	Leadership	☐ Future
	Experience	Strategy	Re-Engineering	Changes	Development	Workplace
	Maturity		Vision	☐ NOVA 2021/22		
			☐ ALM	Delivery		
			Optimization	☐ IT		
			☐ Op Risk	Transformation & TRM/ISM		
			Management	NOVA Op		
				Readiness		
Impacted		Арр	rox. number of		Level of Impact	
Groups:		affec	ted individuals			
•	Employees			☐Significant ☐	Moderate □Mir	or ⊠None
	Service Centers			☐Significant ☐	Moderate □Mir	
	Autopac Agents			☐Significant ☐	Moderate □Mir	or ⊠None
	Partners			\square Significant \square	Moderate □Mir	or ⊠None
	MPI Customers			⊠Significant ⊠	Moderate □Mir	or \square None
	Others, please	Claim	s, Salvage, AOL	⊠Significant ⊠	Moderate \square Mir	or \square None
	specify	(See	Note below?			

Epic

Background

Description:

This new Epic is dependent on the completed Business Case #21-04-e-transfer capability (also referred to as an e-transfer enabler) The e-transfer Total Loss Epic provides a source to use the e-transfer enabler not added scope to the e-transfer capability Epic. The e-transfer enabler is a generic service intended to support multiple sources as required. The planned solution closely aligns with the EFT and Cheque process where [Redacted] is utilized.

Notes re: Impacted Groups

Initial assessments by the CARS support team indicates the e-Transfer Total Loss Epic is not needing updates to AOL. System changes to CARS, interface changes to [Redacted] and processes in Finance and Salvage are initially expected.

Epic Description

For eligible customers/lienholders/(leasing) companies

who are owed monies for a Total Loss settlement, payment will be provided through eTransfer (Electronic Funds Transfer) to their bank accounts through

the MPI eTransfer service which

is a MPI controlled bank to bank mechanism of cash transfer

that eliminates the need for cheques/delays

unlike the current cheque based payment method used for Total Loss settlement payments that delay cash transfer and creates significant administration delays/costs

our solution provides a fast, cost effective and alternative payment method than a cheque issuance for transferring monies to customers/lienholders and companies eligible to receive an eTransfer payment.

Business Outcome Hypothesis:

The measurable benefits that the business can anticipate if the epic hypothesis is proven to be correct – leading to a reduction in cheques and increasing the effectiveness of cash delivery to our claimants/customers. The primary wins from e-Transfer are:

The primary project benefits include:

- 1. improved customer service through available options
- 2. improved customer service through updated technology
- 3. improved customer service through shortened duration between payment approval and receipt
- 4. improved operational efficiencies and cost savings through bulk e-transfer option
- 5. improved system integration whereby customer/claimant e-transfer information can be leveraged
- 6. reduced costs processing e-transfer for volumes over 440 per month, savings per month increase as monthly volumes increase.
- 7. reduced timing of providing payment electronically (same day) versus issuing a cheque (printing, processing, mailing) with an average 3-4 day duration once cheque payment is requested.

Leading Indicators:

- Customer NPS (Net Promoter Score)
- Decrease in cycle times for funds transfers for Total Loss using e-transfer
- Not a significant increase in costs with e-transfer usage versus cheque related costs in comparison to the time savings in providing funds to customers.

Metrics will be developed to measure these Leading Indicators

Non-		Category	Details of NFR
Functional	1	Architecture	Support Design/Solution of integration to/from source to enabler
Requirements (NFRs):	2	Communication, Training & Documentation	Impact to adjuster role for additional steps with customer. Updates to training and procedures. Corp comms to knowledgenet, intranet and public website.
	3	Implementation Approach	Project management will facilitate the planning while the Operational Teams supporting the changes will be involved.
	4	Information and Security	Review and approval of e-transfer file data processed external to MPI enterprise (similar to cheque production process).
	5	Integration	Design/solution of integration to/from source to enabler. Support solution development and testing. Support implementation.
	6	Legal	Current Requirements do not require Legal
	7	Operational Support Model	Service desk process to support redirection of questions or issues. Support of technology issues within the process.
	8	Organizational Change Implications (Roles, Responsibilities)	Potential impact to adjuster role duties to enforce Business rules which would disqualify e-transfer payment in certain scenarios that cannot be system coded.
	9	Vendor Management	
	10	Other - Finance	Finance is the sponsor, and the Finance support teams will be involved in [Redacted] changes, reconciliation requirements
			and any updates to existing reporting. Anticipated areas involved are: Financial batch processing support, Accounts Payable, undeposited funds follow-up, and Reporting.

Delete sample form (page 1 & 2) before submitting EHS template to the LPM Intake page. Upload completed EHS template to the LPM Intake Page and complete the WSJF Calculator template.

Note: If changes are required to the document, locate the Epic Name from the "My Submissions" area, click "Edit", locate the attachment to edit and click to open, click "Edit Document" and edit the save the document. Click the "Save" button at the bottom of the epic form.

Lean Business Case for Total Loss Payment by e-Transfer

Epic/Business Case Name: Total Loss Payment by e-Transfer	Epic Number: 177639	Business Case Number: 2023-010
Prepared By: Kerry Skibinski, Consultant, Agile Program Management Office	Business Case Owner: Michael Gandhi, Corporate Controller, Corporate Controller Office	Business Case Funnel Entry Date: 07/07/2022
Department: Controllers Office	Division: Finance	☑ Single Year Budget ☐ Multi-Year Budget

Epic Funnel Entry Date:	Epic Owner:	Key Stakeholders:
4/29/2022	Dana Frazer, Director, Physical	 Customers
	Damage Claims and Analytics	• Claims
		Salvage
		Finance

Epic Description: (From Epic Hypothesis Statement. Then brief explanation of business need and describe final deliverable) **For** eligible customers/lienholders/(leasing) companies

who are owed monies for a Total Loss settlement, payment will be provided through eTransfer (Electronic Funds Transfer) to their bank accounts through

the MPI eTransfer service which

is a MPI controlled bank to bank mechanism of cash transfer

that eliminates the need for cheques/delays

unlike the current cheque based payment method used for Total Loss settlement payments that delay cash transfer and creates significant administration delays/costs

our solution provides a fast, cost effective and alternative payment method than a cheque issuance for transferring monies to customers/lienholders and companies eligible to receive an eTransfer payment.

This new Epic is dependent on the completed Business Case #21-04-e-transfer capability (also referred to as an e-transfer enabler) The e-transfer Total Loss Epic provides a source to use the e-transfer enabler not added scope to the e-transfer capability Epic. The e-transfer enabler is a generic service intended to support multiple sources as required. The planned solution closely aligns with the EFT and Cheque process where [Redacted] is utilized.

Notes: Impacted Groups

Initial assessments by the CARS support team indicates the e-Transfer Total Loss Epic is not needing updates to AOL. System changes to CARS, interface changes to [Redacted], working with the [Redacted] Software product and process to create the secure e-transfer file and in addition updates to reconciliation processes in Finance are expected. Claims, Finance and FSS (Financial Systems Support) are Groups required to support the development and testing.

store bank account information used in the

12. improved operational efficiencies and cost savings through bulk e-transfer option13. improved system integration whereby customer/claimant e-transfer information

14. reduced costs of issuing cheques (printing,

Direct Deposit process.

can be leveraged

processing, mailing)

	Fait V - VA Appendix 20a - Redacted
☑ Corporate Strategic Initiative/Stream	
☐ Government directive☐ Other	
Brief description	
"Implementing e-Transfer within Total Loss, we will be a and ensure we can get money in hand of our Customer in their lives – Michael Gandhi"	able to significantly improve our Customer experience s in a timely manner that does not create an impediment
Business Outcome Hypothesis: The measurable benefits that the business can anticipate if the epic hypothesis is proven to be correct – leading to a reduction in cheques and increasing the effectiveness of cash delivery to our claimants/customers. The primary wins from e-Transfer are: The primary project benefits include: 8. improved customer service through available options 9. improved customer service through updated technology 10. improved customer service through shortened duration between payment approval and receipt 11. improved operational efficiencies by eliminating the need for MPI to obtain and	 Customer NPS (Net Promoter Score) Decrease in cycle times for funds transfers for Total Loss using e-transfer Decrease in cheque related costs replaced by e-transfer usage Metrics will be developed to measure these Leading Indicators

In Scope:

- Update CARS to allow a new option for Total Loss payments by e-transfer.
- Eligibility rules/requirements will be enforced by the Total Loss Adjuster.
- Eligibility requirements will be defined by the supporting Business Unit(s) (Claims/Salvage).
- System Capture and Total Loss Adjuster manually validates the Customers email required for the etransfer processing.
- Systematic and/or manual, financial reconciliation of processed and nonprocessed/expired etransfer payments.
- Next day processing of the accumulated e-transfers from the previous day.

Out of Scope:

- Other settlement or reimbursement payments are not in-scope for the initial release.
- The CARS system will not systematically determine if the Customer is eligible to receive a Total Loss Payment by e-transfer.
- System validation of the customers email.
- Storage of the Customers email in CARS or AOL.
- Same day / immediate processing of an e-transfer payment request.

Nonfunctional Requirements: (See Epic Hypothesis Statement – that lists definition. In addition list the internal departments that need to be consulted to assess impact to implementation)

- Information Security Office (Technical Review to ensure compliance to corporate policies/standards)
- KMS and/or Claims teams to update existing documentation similar to Cheque requests but adjust for e-transfers.
- Finance team reconciliation readiness.
- KMS to support MPI Intranet and Public website updates of this new payment to Customer option.

 Regulatory Accountability
Does this project require that any new legislation be introduced, or existing legislation be amended or repealed? (Acts or Regulations) ☐ Yes ☑ No
Does this project require that any new Policies and Forms (Regulatory Instruments) be introduced, or existing Policies or Forms be amended or repealed? ☐ Yes ☑ No
If the answer to either question is Yes, the Regulatory Accountability Office must be consulted. The RAO must complete the following:
Review Date: MM/DD/YYYY Reviewer:
This project is determined to be a "Regulatory Project" as per the Regulatory Accountability Act and must be coordinated with the RAO: Yes No

Minimum Viable Product (MVP) Features — (early indicator — functional, working, in production and delivers value. Example is MS 365 and how basic functionality was created as initial MVP and plan is for features to be added — calendar (feature), file sharing (feature), etc.)

- Update CARS to allow a new option for Total Loss payments by e-transfer. (No other settlement or reimbursement payments are in-scope for the initial release)
- Capture the Customers email as input for etransfer requests. There is no requirement to store the email in CARS, the email can be logged as part of the [Redacted] processing.
- Next day processing of the e-transfer request (not immediate processing).
- Customer challenge question unique to the Customer will be issued for each e-transfer.

Additional Potential Features — (building on the MVP — represents other features of lower priority and anticipated timing.)

- CARS Add systematic rules/logic to support eligibility requirements for Customers allowed to receive e-transfer payment.
- CARS Add ability to provide payments for other settlement / reimbursements.
- CARS Add ability to send e-transfer via SMS (requires e-transfer enabler feature to be available).
- CARS Add ability to systematically validate the Customers email and store the email with the Customer record (storing the Customer email may require AOL-IWS to be updated)

Analysis Summary: (Brief summary of the analysis that has been formed to create the business case. Outcome of discussion from Cadence meetings resulting from Epic Hypothesis Statement, and reference material (white papers), preliminary costing – benefits as part of the outcomes defined in the Epic Hypothesis Statement. Any proof of concepts that were completed – artifacts and research.)

This e-payment option primarily benefits MPI's external customers who, when requesting payment for their total loss vehicle claim, will have a faster option for receiving these funds. Currently we quote customers 3-5 business days as the time it takes for a cheque to be requested, printed, mailed and delivered. Subject to operational delays and weekends, it could be over a calendar week before the customer receives payment. With this new process, e-transfers will be processed at the same time as the daily cheque requests, allowing customers to receive payment within 24 hours.

The customer also enjoys an easier process receiving the funds into their account as it can be done with a few clicks on their device, or in the case of customers with auto-deposit enabled, no action required.

This digital transaction also eliminates some risk in terms of lost, stolen or delayed cheque payments.

Internally, e-payment does not provide any operational efficiency gain as we are only adding options to an existing process, not eliminating any steps in Total Loss.

There will be minor internal cost savings on postage and internal mail processing for eliminated paper cheques. The application of e-payment is expected to be limited to simple, single-customer payments. Joint-payments (ie. to customers and lien-holders such as banks) will not be eligible.

Milestones/Checkpoints —(Include milestone or checkpoint dates for MVP(s) start/completion if known)

The work is expected to be planned out and potentially started within Program Increment 7 (July 18/22 – Oct 9/22) based on supporting teams' capacity and work prioritization in PI 7.

Cost Benefit section outlines the Customer from 2021 that were eligible and the associated savings. E-transfer does contain some risk in that email addresses can be input incorrectly and CARS does not have the ability to validate them.	
Approval Request/Recommendation for LPM Committee: (Define on detailed costing to be completed to support the recommendation.) Approval is requested to implement e-Transfer as an option for To Estimated total cost to implement is estimated at \$_175K to be	otal Loss payments by Q3 of FY2022-23.

Solution Analysis- (completed in collaboration with Solution Group – i.e. Epic Owner and APMO) The Cadence meetings will assist in this process with input from stakeholders

Which Internal and/or external customers are affected, and how? (Describe the user community and any markets affected)

Internal users - Total Loss adjusters who create payment requests will learn the new process. This is anticipated to be a seamless process to integrate into the existing workflow.

External customers – will receive their payments much more quickly and with greater security. This will enhance the customer experience. Allowing the Corporation be in line with payment experiences offered by other digitized companies offering a similar service.

What is the potential impact on solutions, programs and services? CARS Front End system changes, updates to supporting interfaces between CARS and [Redacted], Claims processes supporting Total Loss settlements, [Redacted] processing of file containing e-transfer(s), Finance reconciliation processes, system and procedural updates by Claims and Finance teams. Updated process for Total Loss Adjusters to support new payment option.

What is the potential impact on sales, distribution, deployment and support? (N/A)

Forecasted Costs – TO BE COMPLETED BY SOLUTION GROUP			
T-Shirt Estimates	Details		
Medium \$100 - 250K			
MVP Cost: (What is the investment requested to fund the	Estimated Implementation Cost: (What is the estimated		
MVP (the MVP cost)? Include date of MVP cost estimate being requested. See completed MVP Estimating Costing Tool)	investment (cost) of full implementation of the epic if the MVP hypothesis is proven true? This estimate is refined of over time)		
requested. See completed WVF Estimating Costing Tooly	hypothesis is proven true: This estimate is refined by over time;		
	Initial estimate: (This can be expressed as a range)		
	Refined estimate(s): (Identify material updates to the estimated		
	implementation cost, usually informed from experiments. Include date		
	of refined estimate. See completed Lean Implementation Estimating Costing Tool)		
	,,		

Forecasted	Doturno

Type of Return: (Market share, increased revenue, improved productivity, new markets served, reduced risk, financial net present value etc.)

Development Strategy (completed in collaboration with Solution Group)

In-house or Outsourced Development:

In-House development. (Claims, Finance, FSS)

Incremental Implementation Strategy: (Epics are defined as a single whole, but each epic undergoes incremental implementation. Click <u>here</u> for details on potential strategies. i.e. Spike first, Some features first, Architectural epic first, vertical slice, concurrent/sequential implementation etc.)

Sequencing and Dependencies:

The e-transfer enabler Epic performs the e-transfer request processing. The work to complete the enabler is planned to be executed in PI 7 and may utilize the same groups or resources required to support the Total Loss Payment by e-transfer Epic.

Risk Analysis

Risks/Obstacles of Proceeding with Project

(A high likelihood of risk without sufficient planned action for mitigation may impact the discount rate used in calculating the Net Present Value of forecasted financial benefits. Impact to be discussed with VMO)

venejus. Impaci to ve atscussea with vivio)							
Potential Risk	Likelihood	Severity	Description of Impact of Risk and description of planned action taken to mitigate this risk				
Dependency on same groups / resources utilized within PI-7.	☑ HIGH ☑ MEDIUM □ Low	☑ HIGH □ Medium □ Low	Competing work priorities and limited capacity will impede progress on this enabler with the risk of impacting an expected Q3 delivery. Consistent monitoring will need to identify potential risk triggers and re-allocate capacity where possible, refocus work on resources having capacity or assessing other work priorities with leadership to accept the risk or re-prioritize competing work.				
Incorrect email captured by Total Loss Adjuster during the payment request process.	☐ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low	☑ High □ Medium □ Low	A manual process with the Total Loss adjuster to verify the email with the Customer is anticipated. Total Loss Adjuster sends test email to provided Customer email. Customer returns email. Adjuster speaks verbally with Customer to provide verification password/code or other. This is provided in the email exchange as a confirmation.				
[Redacted] software requires vendor support.	☐ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low	☑ High □ Medium □ Low	FSS indicates potential vendor involvement from [Redacted] software to support the e-transfer file creation. This may result in additional costs which will be a Change Request.				

Risks/Obstacles of NOT Pr	oceeding wi	th Project					
Potential Risk	Likelihood	Severity	Description of Impact of Risk				
			and description of planned				
			action taken to mitigate this risk				
The existing process of Total Loss payment by Cheque will	☑ High □ Medium	☑ High □ Medium	Customers needing a quick payment after a Total Loss will have to incur the time involved				
remain as the single choice.	☐ Low	☐ Low	in processing a cheque and receiving via the mail.				
	☐ High	☐ High					
	☐ Medium	☐ Medium					
	☐ Low	☐ Low					
	☐ High	☐ High					
	☐ Medium	☐ Medium					
	☐ Low	□Low					
Assumptions							
(What are you assuming to be true, or what conditions are you assuming will prevail that will make this achievable)							
Cost Assumptions (What sources were used to generate	e costs)						
Cost/Benefit Assumptions	Sing	Single Owners eligible for payments – Volume: 16,403					

Cost to process cheques: \$20, 290.08

Calculated cost to process eTransfers next day: \$17,947.25 The higher per volume each / each year increases savings versus

Cheque processing to reach the Customer is typically 3 days. e-Transfer payment would reach Customer within 24 hours.

	Alternative S	olutions
(Describe at	least two available alternatives th	nat would achieve the project objectives)
Alternative 1		
Alternative 2		
Evaluation Areas	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Benefits (Financial/Non-		
financial)		
Cost		
Risk		
Reason for not selecting this		
solution		

processing cheques.

Actual CARS Payment Data from 2021

Other Assumptions

Additional Supporting Data (completed in collaboration with Solution Group)

Attachments: (Other supporting documentation, links to other data, feasibility or trade studies, models, market analysis, etc., that were used in the creation of the business case)

Other Notes and Comments: (Any additional miscellaneous Information relevant to LPM)